LOCATING LOW-INCOME HOUSING
THROUGHOUT A METROPOLITAN REGION

A THESIS

Presented to

The Faculty of the Division of Graduate

Studies and Research

By

Martin Roy Jarret

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of City Planning

Georgia Institute of Technology

July, 1973

LOCATING LOW-INCOME HOUSING

THROUGHOUT A METROPOLITAN REGION

Approved:

Roger Rupnow, Chairman

Anthony Catanese

Bowles Ford

Date approved by Chairman: Aug. 3 1973

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis is dedicated to the author's wife, Kathy. Without her assistance, encouragement and faith, this project could not have been completed.

The author expresses his appreciation to Professor Roger Rupnow and Dr. Anthony Catanese of the Graduate City Planning Program of the Georgia Institute of Technology, for their advice and assistance. The author also expresses his appreciation to Mr. Bowles Ford, Chief of the Housing Division of the Atlanta Regional Commission, for his advice and assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1968, The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders warned that the United States was rapidly becoming two separate nations: one poor and black, and the other affluent and white.[1] In metropolitan regions, the poor black population is increasingly locating in the central cities, while the affluent white population is increasingly locating in the suburbs and outlying areas. According to the 1970 census of Population, 11 per cent of the families in the central city have incomes below the poverty level, compared to only 6 per cent in the suburbs and outlying areas.[2] The central cities also have a growing percentage of non-white residents. In 1970, 29.1 per cent of the central city population was non-white, while the suburbs and outlying areas had a 6 per cent non-white population.[3] These figures have increased substantially since 1960 from 17.8 per cent and 5 per cent, respectively. Cities such as Atlanta, Newark (New Jersey), Gary (Indiana), and Washington, D.C. presently have black majorities. Continuation of present trends will produce black majorities in New Orleans, Richmond (Virginia), Chicago, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Detroit, Cleveland, Baltimore, and Oakland.[4] Central cities are losing the diverse ethnic, racial and economic mix they once had, while the suburbs are becoming a separate nation. A significant reason for the large poor and black population in the central cities is the location pattern of low-income housing.

Low-income housing is defined in this thesis as housing occupied by families who cannot afford standard housing without some form of subsidy. Low-income housing is designed for the segment of the population in which the need for standard housing exceeds the ability to pay. These families lack an effective demand because of a lack of income, which results in curtailed buying power.

Several discussions in this thesis include moderate-income housing. Moderate-income housing refers to the programs for families above the poverty line but with incomes which do not exceed approximately 135 per cent of the income limit established for the public housing programs. Moderate-income housing, therefore, fills the gap between the low-income housing programs and the housing available on the private market.

The primary method of providing standard housing for low-income families has been the various Federal housing subsidy programs. In most metropolitan areas, the majority of these subsidized housing units has been concentrated in the inner cities. For example, in 1969, 95 per cent of the subsidized housing units and only 27 per cent of the population of the Miami Valley Metropolitan Area were in the City of Dayton.[5] In 1971, 88 per cent of the subsidized housing units and 40 per cent of the population of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area were in the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.[6] These examples are typical of the location pattern of subsidized housing in most metropolitan areas.

A possible second method by which low-income families can be provided with sound housing, in addition to the various subsidy programs, is the filtering process. The filtering process is the process by which occupancy changes as the housing occupied by one income group becomes available to the next lower income group as a result of a decline in market price. Filtering does not occur until one or more households determine that the used housing that is released, or the newly-built housing, represents an advantageous alternative to the housing that they are presently occupying. Therefore, the requisite of the filtering process is a decline in housing value based upon a decline in the desirability of the present housing in relation to alternatives.[7]

The filtering process has not provided standard housing units for low-income families. Filtering cannot occur unless there is a sufficient amount of new construction to create a surplus of housing at some level.[8] The major factor preventing the filtering process from working is that as soon as surplus housing appears on the market, production slows down until the surplus is absorbed.[9]

Because of the substantial shortage of housing available to lower-income groups, the housing which becomes available to the lowest income groups through the filtering process is usually physically deteriorated to a point warranting clearance. Because these housing units can be rented and local housing codes are not stringently enforced, clearance rarely occurs.[10] The filtering process is therefore an inadequate solution for providing low-income families with standard housing. "The end product of filtering, at the bottom of the chain reaction, is substandard housing; thus filtering produces that very blight which we seek to remedy."[11]

The low quality of housing that is occupied by low-income residents partially demonstrates the fact that the filtering process has not provided low-income families with sound housing. There is a high correlation between poverty and occupancy of substandard housing, as shown below.[12]

Table 1. Percentage of Households in Specific Income Groups Occupying Substandard Housing in Metropolitan Areas—1960

Annual Income (Dollars in Thousands)	White (Per Cent)	Nonwhite (Per Cent)
Under 2.0	21	45
2.0 to 2.9	15	35
3.0 to 3.9	12	28
4.0 to 4.9	9	21
5.0 to 5.9	6	16
6.0 to 6.9	4	14
7.0 to 9.9	2	9
Over 10.0	1	7
All Incomes	7	28

As indicated by the above table, of the families living in substandard housing within metropolitan areas, the majority are poor and they are disproportionately nonwhite.

The housing problem is most critical for nonwhites living in the central city. For example, in 1960, 25 per cent of all nonwhites living in central cities occupied substandard units, compared to 8 per cent of all whites.[13] In addition, nonwhites pay relatively high rent for this poor housing. In most cities, few white families pay more than 25 per cent of their income for housing. Over one-third of the nonwhite families pay more than 35 per cent of their income on rent.[14] Thus, nonwhite central city families pay more for housing relative to their income, than do the more affluent. Since the cost of shelter is a basic necessity and cannot be deferred, low-income families generally have insufficient money left for adequate diet, clothing, medical care, education and household furnishings.

The housing problem for low-income families is therefore broader than simply the physical conditions of a housing unit or a neighborhood. A low-income family living in a standard unit, but paying 45 per cent of its income for rent and, consequently, not eating well, is just as much a part of the housing problem as the low-income family living in a substandard unit and unable to spend any additional money on housing.

As the housing crisis has worsened in the central cities, it is being realized that the solutions to the problems may not be found in the central cities alone. Several planning agencies throughout the country have begun taking a regional approach to the housing problems.

Most agencies have accepted the broad and basic goal of a "decent home and a suitable living environment," as stated in the preamble of the Housing Act of 1949. Several agencies are expanding this goal to include a wider geographic housing choice for all economic groups.

In 1970, the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission adopted the goal "To expand the range of housing opportunity for everyone geographically."[15] Several other regional planning agencies have adopted similar goals regarding a geographic choice in housing for all citizens.

Rather than continuing to concentrate low-income housing in the central city, these agencies are attempting to locate the housing units throughout the metropolitan region. The distribution of low-income housing is being recognized as a regional problem, best solved through the cooperative efforts of all local governments within the region.

Reasons for Distributing Low-Income Housing

There are several reasons for locating low-income housing throughout a metropolitan region, which includes the suburbs and the central city. These reasons are described as follows.

Outside the Central City

The reasons for distributing low-income housing outside the central city, rather than continuing to concentrate these units in the central city, are as follows.

1. *Wider Housing Choice*. There are minimal opportunities for housing choice for low-income families in metropolitan regions due to the continued concentration of low-income housing in the central cities. The distribution of low-income housing throughout a metropolitan region is intended to provide low-income families the opportunity to choose housing in any reasonable location, including the suburbs.

A wider choice of housing depends on providing low-income housing in areas outside of the central cities. Appropriate sites for low-income housing are often not available in central cities because the land is too expensive and difficult to assemble.[16] There is presently an ample supply of vacant land suitable for low-income housing in a ten-mile wide belt around all of the major cities in the United States, except New York and Los Angeles where it is necessary to go 20 miles. In the nation's 20 largest metropolitan areas, 99 per cent of the vacant land is located outside the central city.[17]

In addition, since vacant land is scarce in the central cities, the construction of new housing often requires the demolition of the older housing units. This cycle of demolition and rebuilding is expensive and it decreases the vacancy rates in the older neighborhoods where the low-income families now live. This pattern, which retards the market forces necessary to encourage the private maintenance and rehabilitation of older neighborhoods, decreases housing choice in these neighborhoods.[18]

2. *Opportunity for an Improved Environment.* Locating low-income housing outside of the central cities allows low-income families an opportunity for a healthier living environment. In 1968, the President's Commission on Urban Housing said:

> The location of ones place of residence determines the accessibility and quality of many everyday advantages taken for granted by the mainstreams of American society. Among these commonplace advantages are public education facilities for a family's children, adequate police and fire protection, and a decent surrounding environment. In any case, a family should have the choice of living as close as economically possible to the breadwinners place of employment.
>
> It makes little sense for Federally subsidized housing to be concentrated in and around the central cities slums where social and environmental disadvantages can negate the uplifting qualities of a decent home.[19]

The people living in the urban slums are the products of the urban problem, not its cause. New housing units built near or within the slums can seldom improve the environmental effect created by the larger area. It is increasing the present problem to build housing in areas in which families unable to adjust to the economic and social requirements of a society are crowded close to others unable to adjust.[20]

The concentration of low-income housing units in the central city has also intensified the problems of overcrowding. For example, in the District of Columbia, 12 per cent of all occupied housing units are overcrowded. This figure is 400 per cent above the average for all other jurisdictions of the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Area which is 3 per cent.[21]

3. *Wider Job Opportunities*. Over the last two decades 80 per cent of the new jobs created in the nation's larger metropolitan areas have been located in the suburbs.[22] The labor market distribution in metropolitan areas has become the reverse of the housing distribution. Most suburban residents are traveling to the central city for their employment, while the jobs in which the poor are usually employed, such as manufacturing, retailing and wholesaling, are increasingly locating in the suburbs. The Report of the National Commission on Urban Problems stated:

> Available employment of the type for which slum adults might qualify in, generally are not available in the slum. In a recent year, 63 per cent of all construction permits for industrial buildings were issued for locations outside central cities. On the other hand, 73 per cent of office building construction permits were issued inside central cities. Central cities increasingly are becoming white-collar employment centers while the suburbs are becoming the job employment areas for new blue collar workers. This is ironical in view of the fact that low paid blue-collar workers, especially if they are Negroes, live in the central cities while the white-collar workers are increasingly living in the suburbs. Traveling to work becomes increasingly difficult for both. Whites and blacks, white-collars and blue-collars, pass each other by as they go to and come from work.[23]

Due to this decentralization of the economy, many jobs are inaccessible to low-income residents. The present transportation system in metropolitan areas is not conducive to bringing low-income poor to suburban jobs for the following reasons:

a. The public transportation system is intended to bring people from the suburbs to jobs concentrated in the central city. Because of fiscal constraints, and the wide decentralization of employment centers, the public transportation system is not able to bring large numbers of central city residents to scattered suburban job sites.[24]

b. Although these jobs are often accessible by highways, many ghetto residents cannot afford an automobile to utilize this resource.

c. The willingness of an individual to travel to work is inversely related to the length of the journey to work. Therefore, many inner-city low-income individuals are not willing to travel long distances to suburban job sites.[25]

4. *Central City Tax Bases.* Central cities cannot afford the increasing concentration of poverty caused by the concentration of low-income housing. Low-income families have the most critical needs for public services. However, because of the decreasing sources of tax revenues, caused by the migration of industry and upper-income groups to the suburbs, the central cities can no longer adequately respond to

the social and educational needs of the many disadvantaged groups. As an example of the problem, the tax base of the central cities in New Jersey was less than 60 per cent of the suburban level in 1968.[26] Locating low-income housing outside the central city is a necessary step in reversing the trend toward inner-city decay.

5. *Increased School Integration.* Locating low-income housing outside the inner city will increase school integration. Evidence has indicated that integrated schools are the best guarantees of equality in education. Low-income students can substantially improve their educational achievements.[27] In addition, in view of the recent court ordered integration of schools throughout the country, locating low-income housing in the outer city can assist in minimizing the controversial busing of school children.

6. *Citizen Support.* No pattern of metropolitan development is sound if it does not consider the locational choices of all its citizens. Many low-income central-city residents desire the opportunity to live in areas outside the central city. A survey was recently conducted in Dayton, Ohio, in which low- and moderate-income central-city Dayton residents were interviewed.[28] Each household was asked the following question: "If you had the following two choices, which would you pick: a) A new home in this immediate area, or b) A new home outside the city somewhere in the suburbs?" The results of the survey are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Preferences for New House Location

Location Preferred	Total Households	White Households	Black Households
Prefer Own Neighborhood	51%	43%	61%
Prefer Suburbs	44	53	34
Indifferent to Location	5	4	5

A substantial number of respondents preferred a new home in the suburbs. White respondents were far more receptive to living in the suburbs than were black families. The majority of respondents preferred to remain in their immediate area. However, these survey results do not negate the legitimacy of policies to locate low-income housing outside the central city, since these policies are only intended to provide low-income families desiring to locate in the suburbs with the opportunity to exercise that choice. These families represent a substantial percentage of the inner-city low-income population.

Although the inner-city black community has not vigorously espoused a policy of locating low-income housing outside the inner city, several independent national organizations and suburban activists are waging the battle in their behalf.[29] For example, in 1969 William Morris of the NAACP referred to the suburbs as the "new civil rights battleground" and the organization members endorsed "metropolitan wide approaches to freedom of choice in housing location."[30]

The reasons for the modest level of citizen support for locating low-income housing in the suburbs are attributable, in part, to the following.

a. The causal link between the present concentration of low-income housing and the problems of unemployment, inadequate schools and the de facto segregation of public facilities is relatively obscure.

b. The low-income population concentrated in the inner city are poorly educated and due to their social isolation, are often unable to look beyond their immediate needs in the central city.

7. *Court Trends.* Trends in court decisions have resulted in a movement toward a policy of dispersing low-income housing. In the 1969 case of *Gautreaux vs. Chicago Housing Authority*, a Federal Court set forth detailed guidelines for the dispersal of public housing in Chicago. The Housing Authority was shown to have passed over sites located in white neighborhoods.[31] Similar court action came in 1970 in the case of *Shannon vs. HUD*. The Court of Appeals barred HUD from building public housing in an area of minority concentration.[32] In 1971, a United States District Court ordered the dispersal of public housing in areas outside of the City of Atlanta.[33]

These court decisions have prompted HUD to establish a policy that new publicly-supported housing must be dispersed into non-ghetto areas.[34] The *Gautreaux* and *Shannon* cases have also led to the development of HUD's Project Selection Criteria for federally-subsidized housing. These criteria give highest ratings to projects which are (1) outside of minority concentrations; (2) located in areas containing little or no subsidized housing; having good recreational, educational, and health facilities; and which are reasonably convenient to job sites; and (3) are located in areas free from adverse environmental conditions.[35] A proposed project in the suburbs would usually mean a superior rating by all of these standards and thus would be approved prior to one in a less attractive inner-city location.

In the Central City

Policies to distribute low-income housing throughout a metropolitan region should include locating new housing units in the central city. Although low-income housing units are needed outside the central city, there is still a need for low-income housing units in the central city. Many low-income residents prefer to live in their present neighborhood, rather than in the suburbs, according to the survey, conducted in the Miami Valley Region, which is summarized in Table 2. In addition, a large percentage of the metropolitan economy is and will remain in the central city. New low-income housing is therefore needed to replace the existing dilapidated units. Large-scale rehabilitation projects are also needed to reclaim the usable existing units. Policies to include new low-income housing units in the central city, as part of a regional policy, is necessary if low-income families are to have a significant choice in selecting sound housing units.

Purpose of Thesis

The purposes of this thesis are as follows:

1. To describe and evaluate present regional distribution plans for low-income housing.

2. To formulate guidelines and make recommendations for

developing regional distribution plans.

3. To determine and describe the obstacles to implementing regional distribution plans.

4. To recommend methods for overcoming the obstacles to implementing regional distribution plans.

Methodology

Information included in this thesis has been obtained from a survey of literature pertaining to distributing low-income housing throughout metropolitan regions, and personal interviews with individuals involved in this field. In addition, a survey was conducted between January 31 and February 16, 1973, of 19 planning agencies throughout the country involved with the regional distribution of low-income housing. A copy of the survey mailed to the planning agencies appears in Appendix A. Appendix B lists the agencies surveyed and the status of their plans.

The major purposes of this survey was to determine (a) the status of various distribution plans; (b) the frequency and severity of obstacles to implementing a distribution plan; (c) methods used for overcoming these obstacles; and (d) proposed methods or legislation needed for implementation. The survey and the survey results are further described in Chapter IV.

Organization of the Thesis

Chapter II describes several regional distribution plans for low-income housing which have been formulated throughout the United States.

Chapter III evaluates the various strategies which have been used for developing regional distribution plans. Guidelines and recommendations for formulating these plans are also described.

Chapter IV describes the results of the survey to determine the frequency and severity of the obstacles to implementing regional distribution plans. The obstacles are described and recommendations are made to assist in overcoming each respective obstacle.

Chapter V contains a summary and conclusions.

CHAPTER II

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION PLANS

Several regional planning agencies, attempting to provide diversity of choice in housing location for all income groups, have formulated regional distribution plans for low-income housing. These plans are often referred to as distribution plans, "fair-share" plans, allocation plans or "opportunity" plans. In this thesis, these plans will be referred to as regional distribution plans. Regional distribution plans describe the allocation policies for the future location of low-income housing. These plans are intended to describe priorities and responsibilities for all the various jurisdictions within the region.

Regional distribution plans for low-income housing do not necessarily result in the development of low-income housing. These plans recommend patterns of development within a region for low-income housing. Plans can, however, encourage or influence developers, sponsors and planning agencies to comply with the plan and may encourage the authorization for the allocated units.[36] It should be noted that the regional distribution plans described in this thesis, have also included the subsidized housing programs for moderate-income families.

These plans have primarily been developed by county or multi-county planning agencies of councils of government. However, there are considerable differences in the size of the jurisdictions of agencies which have developed regional distribution plans. Table 3 lists the type of agency and the size of the jurisdiction for a sample of distribution plans. This thesis will refer to the agency formulating a regional distribution plan as a regional planning agency.

Table 3. Jurisdictions of Agencies Developing Distribution Plans

Region	Type of Agency	Size of Jurisdiction	1970 Population
SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA	County Planning Department	Valley portion of San Bernardino County (excludes the rural mountain and desert parts of the county)	611,768 (Valley portion only)
WASHINGTON, D.C.	Council of Governments	District of Columbia and five counties	2,861,123
MIAMI VALLEY, OHIO	Regional Planning Commission	Five counties including the City of Dayton	900,988
MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL METROPOLITAN AREA	Metropolitan Council	Seven counties including the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis	1,874,535
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA REGION	Regional Area Planning Commission	Six counties including the city of Sacramento	895,492
BUCKS COUNTY	County Planning Department	One county	415,156
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION	Association of Governments	Nine counties including the city of San Francisco	4,628,194

In developing regional distribution plans for low-income housing, there are three basic steps which have been followed by planning agencies. These are[37]

(1) The designation of subareas within the region.

(2) The selection of criteria to be used in the plan.

(3) The distribution strategy to be used in the distribution of units.

Subareas, criteria, and strategies are defined below.

Subareas are geographic units which form the geographic basis for allocating the low-income housing units to the specific jurisdictions or areas within the region.

Criteria are quantitative indexes of various social, economic and physical characteristics of the subareas within the region. These criteria are used as the data base for apportioning the allocations. The minority population of a subarea, and the fiscal resources of a subarea are examples of criteria.

Strategies consist of the rationale and the mechanics of the plan. Strategies determine how the selected criteria are to be combined, the methodology for determining allocations, and the basis for the total number of units to be distributed.

The major objective in utilizing these three steps in describing regional distribution plans is to provide a common framework by which similarities and dissimilarities between plans can be understood. A description of how several planning agencies have approached these basic steps follows.

Designation of Subareas

Agencies must divide their region into smaller units, called subareas in this thesis. These subareas are the geographic basis for allocating low-income housing units to specific jurisdictions or areas within the region. Table 4 compares the makeup and the number of subareas in several regions.

Table 4. Sample of Low-Income Housing Distribution Subareas

Region	Description of Subareas	Number of Subareas	Average Subarea Population
SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY	"planning districts" composed of several census tracts.	15	40,768
WASHINGTON, D.C.	"jurisdictions" composed of cities, towns and counties.	15	190,742
MIAMI VALLEY	"planning units" composed of townships or groups of townships.	53	16,999
MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL	municipalities or portion of municipalities.	191	9,814
SACRAMENTO	"regional planning districts"	39	22,916
BAY AREA	(Subareas have not been designated yet)		
BUCKS COUNTY	(Subareas have not been designated yet)		

There is a wide variation in the sizes of the subareas which have been designated by the regions studied. In addition, there are differences in the composition of the subareas. The regions studied have used either planning units or political jurisdictions as subareas. However, all the regions have designated subareas in which data are available and can be periodically updated, which is essential in developing regional distribution plans for low-income housing.

Criteria Utilized

In developing a regional distribution plan for low-income housing, criteria must be selected. There are numerous criteria upon which a distribution plan can be based. The criteria used for regional distribution plans can be grouped into three general categories. These three general categories are:

(1) demand

(2) fair-share

(3) suitability.

Table 5 compares the criteria within each of these three categories, which have been utilized by seven regional planning agencies. An explanation of the three general categories, and a description of each of the criteria within these categories follows.

1. *Demand.* Demand criteria in a regional distribution plan increases the number of low-income housing units allocated to those subareas with the greatest ineffective demand. Ineffective demand indicates the need for low-income housing within the subareas. Demand criteria have been quantified in regional distribution plans by the following:

(a) number of low-income families

(b) deficient housing conditions

Table 5. Criteria Used for Low-Income Housing Distribution Plans

Criteria	San[1] Ber-nardino	Wash-ing ton	Miami Valley	Twin Cities	Sacra-mento[1]	Bay Area[3]	Bucks County[2,3]
Number of Criteria	8	8	6	2	6	6	11
1. DEMAND CRITERIA							
a. Low-Income Families	X		X		X	X	X
b. Overcrowding		X					
c. Deficient Housing	X	X					
d. Non-Residential Low-Income Jobs		X				X	
2. FAIR-SHARE CRITERIA							
a. Equal Share	X		X		X	X	
b. Proportion to Population	X		X		X	X	X
c. Income			X		X		
d. Present Concentration of Low-Income Housing		X		X			X
3. SUITABILITY CRITERIA							
a. Schools-Assessed Value			X		X		
b. Schools-Overcrowding	X		X				X
c. Fiscal Resources		X				X	
d. Local Jobs	X	X			X		X
e. Vacant Land	X	X					X
f. Vacant Housing Units		X					X
g. Existing Development				X			X[2]
h. Environmental Factors						X	
i. Projected Growth							X

[1]Does not include intra-subarea criteria.

[2]Bucks County treats the existing development of sewers, highways, and public transportation separately.

[3]Tentative.

(c) overcrowding

(d) non-residential jobs in a subarea.

a. Low-Income Families. The number of low-income families living in a juristiction has been the most often used index of demand in distribution plans to date. Miami Valley and San Bernardino have both used the number of households earning less than $10,000 annually.[38] Miami Valley adjusted this index to $7,000 for rural areas. Sacramento uses an index of less than $5,000 annual earnings for low-income families and $5,000-$8,000 for moderate-income families.[39] The greater the number of families in this category, the greater the demand and, hence, the greater the share of new units.

b. Deficient Housing Conditions. Washington, D.C. COG uses the number of deficient housing units in a jurisdiction as a demand criterion.[40] The County of San Bernardino limited this criterion to the deficient housing units affordable by the indicated income group.[41] The greater the number of deficient units, the greater the share of new units allocated to the subarea.

c. Overcrowding. Washington, D.C. COG utilizes the number of overcrowded housing units as an index of demand.[42] The greater the number of overcrowded units in a jurisdiction, the greater the share of new units.

d. Non-Residential Jobs. Washington, D.C. COG has used and The Association of Bay Area Governments is proposing to use the number of low-income heads of households who commute into each local jurisdiction for work, as an index of demand.[43] This factor is used to reduce the present disparity between place of residence and place of work which results in costly and time-consuming commuting. Jurisdictions receive a higher proportion of new units if a high number of such persons enter for employment.

2. *Fair-Share.* Fair-share criteria increases the number of low-income housing units allocated to subareas which have less than their share of the total number of low-income housing units within the metropolitan area. Fair-share criteria have been quantified in regional distribution plans by the following:

(a) equal-share
(b) proportional to population
(c) income
(d) present concentration of low-income housing.

a. Equal Share. This criterion determines what share each jurisdiction would receive if all jurisdictions received an equal amount of housing units.

b. Proportion to Population. This criterion allocates a proportionate share of new housing units to each jurisdiction according to its proportionate share of the region's population.

c. Income. This criterion is used to redistribute the present concentration of low-income families in the central cities. Low-income housing units are allocated inversely to the proportion of low-income households, so that the greater the existing proportion of low-income families, the smaller the share of new low-income units.

d. Present Concentration of Low-Income Housing. This criterion is specifically used to promote greater diversity in housing location. Washington, D.C. COG utilizes the percentage of all housing units in each jurisdiction valued at less than $25,000 or renting for less than $150 per month.[44] The smaller the percentage of low-income housing units, the higher the allocation of these units.

3. *Suitability.* Suitability criteria determines whether low-income housing is appropriate for a subarea. Although a subarea has a demand for low-income housing or does not have a fair-share of low-income housing, the subarea will not necessarily be a suitable location for low-income housing. The introduction of low-income housing could be detrimental to a subarea and the new residents if suitability criteria are not considered. Suitability criteria have been quantified in regional distribution plans by the following:

(a) schools—assessed value

(b) schools—overcrowding

(c) fiscal resources

(d) local jobs

(e) vacant land

(f) vacant housing units

(g) existing development

(h) environmental factors

(i) projected growth.

a. Schools—Assessed Valuation. Miami Valley, San Bernardino, and Sacramento have used the assessed valuation per pupil, per average daily attendance or per household, respectively, as a suitability criteria.[45] Although assessed value alone does not determine the monies a jurisdiction actually receives for its schools, it is an indicator of the wealth or potential tax revenues for education and other services and, hence, an area's ability to absorb additional units. The greater the assessed value per student, the greater the number of housing units allocated to a subarea.

b. Schools—Overcrowding. Several agencies have used "pupils in excess of normal capacity" or "existing additional school capacity" as a suitability criteria indicating school overcrowding. The greater the overcrowding, the fewer the housing units allocated to the jurisdiction.

Using this criterion and the preceding one, there may be differences between the school district boundaries and the selected jurisdictions. If there is a difference, compensation can be made by adjusting the assignment to reflect the geographic differences.[46]

c. Per Capita Fiscal Resources. This criterion allocates the new units to jurisdictions with the highest fiscal capability to absorb the units. Washington, D.C. COG defines fiscal resources as the total real estate value of the jurisdiction plus the total of all personal income, divided by the population of the jurisdiction.[47] The higher the fiscal capability, the greater the allocation of new units.

d. Local Jobs. The number of jobs in a jurisdiction is used as an index of desired residential location. Sacramento Regional Area Planning Commission utilizes the number of jobs in the jurisdiction as a percentage of the total jobs in the region.[48] Washington, D.C. COG utilizes the percentage of the Region's jobs within 45 minutes' commuting time of the local jurisdiction.[49] The more jobs in or near a subarea, the greater the allocation of new units. The latter criterion does not necessarily equate the resident's home and job site because of the large geographic area within a 45-minute commuting time.

e. Vacant Residential Land. The San Bernardino County Planning Department uses vacant residential land (five-acre parcels or larger) valued at $10,000 per acre or less as a criterion.[50] Washington, D.C. COG does not include a price limit in its vacant land criteria. It includes all vacant residential land which is sewered or is expected to be sewered within the next six years as indicated by local land use, zoning and sewer service maps.[51]

f. Vacant Housing Units. Washington, D.C. COG utilizes the number of existing vacant housing units, as determined by census data, as a criterion.[52] A large supply of vacant units will reduce the number of new housing units required by low-income families, if the vacant units can be afforded by these families. The greater the number of vacant units, the greater the share of units assigned.

g. Existing Development. The Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area utilizes existing development as the key criterion. There is a high correlation in the Twin Cities Area between the amount of existing development in a community and the availability of necessary and desired services, including sewers, employment opportunities and mass transit and major highways. The Metropolitan Council found that the more developed communities in the region have a greater fiscal capability to provide and support the necessary community services for low-income families. The jurisdictions which were highly developed received a higher "priority" in receiving low-income housing.[53] The priority strategy will be described in the next section.

Bucks County Planning Department's distribution plan is proposing to treat these development elements separately. Sewer capacity, developable land, existing employment, public transportation, and highway capacity will be used as separate criteria.[54]

f. Environmental Factors. The Bay Area considers air quality as a criteria in allocating low-income housing. Areas of poorer air quality, as determined by the Bay Area Air Pollution Control Board, are allocated fewer units.[55]

g. Projected Growth. Bucks County's plan considers projected growth areas in allocating low-income housing units. Projected employment centers and population trends are included in this criterion.[56]

Distribution Strategies

There are several different strategies for formulating regional distribution plans for low-income housing. The five basic distribution strategies utilized by the regions surveyed are based on:

(1) need

(2) federally subsidized units allocated to the region

(3) priority areas

(4) intra-subarea allocations

(5) designated specific sites.

Need

The first regional distribution plan developed was the Housing Plan for the Miami Valley Region, or the Dayton Plan as it is more often called. This dispersal plan is based on low- and moderate-income housing need. This plan computed the low- and moderate-income housing need for each of the five counties within the region and allocated shares of this need to subareas throughout the region.

Need was determined by computing the number of new units required to eliminate dilapidation and overcrowding and to provide a comfortable vacancy rate for low- and moderate-income families. The determination of need did not consider dwelling units in need of rehabilitation. Need figures were broken down by county so that each of the five counties in the region could see its own need as a part of the total regional need.[57]

The allocation of the needed housing units was first done on a county basis, since that was the geographic unit on which the need estimates were made. The needed low- and moderate-housing "fair-shares" were then allocated to the sub-county planning areas using an average of numbers resulting from six of the criteria discussed earlier: (1) equal share, (2) proportionate share of the county's households, (3) proportionate share of the county's households earning less than $10,000 annually or less than $7,000 in the three rural counties, (4) the inverse of number three, (5) assessed valuation per pupil,

(6) overcrowding of the school districts. The result of this regional distribution strategy is an allocation of each county's low- and moderate-income housing need to each subarea within the county.[58]

Federally-Subsidized Units Allocated to the Region

The "Fair Share Housing Formula for Metropolitan Washington," developed by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, is based on the federally-subsidized units allocated to the region. This plan attempts to allocate proportions of these HUD subsidized units for the region among local jurisdictions.

Eight criteria were utilized for this plan. These criteria were classified into three groups--demand, supply, and location. The demand criteria are: overcrowded units, deficient housing units, and non-residential jobs. The supply criteria are: vacant land and vacant housing units. The location criteria are: fiscal resources of each jurisdiction, and current low-income housing.[59]

The eight criteria were combined using a more complicated methodology than Dayton's Plan. This methodology is:

> To arrive at the fair share proportion of low and moderate income housing units for each local jurisdiction, all the demand and supply factors for a given jurisdiction were added together and the sum was multiplied by a modifier consisting of a combination of the three special locational factors. This produces an index number for each jurisdiction which can be figured as a percentage of the total of all local indexes in the metropolitan area. The higher the local index number goes, the higher would be that jurisdiction's share of new low and moderate income housing units.
>
> The modifier was calculated by dividing the local fiscal resources by the existing local concentration of low and moderate income housing units, and multiplying by the accessibility to jobs. This has the effect of allocating more low and moderate income housing units to the "richer" jurisdictions,

> reducing the number of such units allocated to jurisdictions already accommodating their fair share or more, and allocating more of these units in the more accessible parts of the metropolitan area.[60]

Utilizing this formula, 80 per cent of the subsidized housing will go outside the District of Columbia, which presently has 60 per cent of the subsidized units. Fifty per cent of the federally-subsidized housing units are allocated to the two most affluent counties in the region, Fairfax County and Montgomery County.[61]

Priority Areas

The Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area adopted a priority distribution plan for low- and moderate-income housing in December, 1971. This plan is a short-term interim measure, to be used until the Council prepares and adopts a more comprehensive housing plan which will allocate needed housing units throughout the seven-county Metropolitan Area up to the year 1975.[62]

The interim priority plan addresses itself to where housing for low- and moderate-income persons should be developed in the immediate future. The priority distribution plan attempts to achieve two basic objectives:

1. To promote orderly and economic residential development, as well as suitable living environments by directing low- and moderate-income housing to well-serviced locations.

2. To promote a greater diversity of housing opportunities by directing low-and moderate-income housing to areas with relatively fewer housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income persons.[63]

The priority proposal is the simplest allocation strategy to to develop. The plan designates general areas of the region as having various priorities for development of low- and moderate-income housing. The first priority area is the portion of the region where subsidized housing is most desirable as determined by criteria described below. Proposals in these areas receive first priority. Similarly, areas are ranked as second and third priority for low- and moderate-income housing development. The fourth and lowest priority area is the portion of the metropolitan area which is considered inappropriate for subsidized housing in the near future.

Two criteria are used in determining priorities. The first criterion is existing development. The priority plan encouraged housing in areas that are developed, because of the high correlation between areas which are developed and areas with the required services and facilities. In determining priorities, each subarea was assigned to one of four categories depending on their percentage of vacant land as shown in Table 6.[64]

Table 6. Twin Cities Development Categories

Category	Percentage of Vacant and Agricultural Land
1. Mostly Developed	0-35
2. Developing/Developed	36-60
3. Rural/Developing	61-89
4. Mostly rural	90 and Over

Free-standing rural communities, with a population of less than 10,000, are an exception to the above procedure. Although many rural communities have a fairly high percentage of developed land, they do not have the level of services and facilities which are characteristic of municipalities with the same extent of development in the urban areas. Therefore, small rural communities are classified as inappropriate for the development of subsidized housing projects in the near future, despite the amount of development.

The second criterion is the percentage of existing low and moderate housing. To promote a greater diversity of housing choice, priority is given to subareas with the lowest percentage of existing low- and moderate-income housing, after the general areas of priority for development have been determined. This criterion is used to rank competing proposals within the same priority category. The result of this strategy is that the closer-in suburban communities are designated as highest priority for low-income housing in the region.

Special Treatment Areas. There are two areas which receive special treatment in this approach. These exceptions are (1) central cities and (2) new towns or large-scale planned unit developments.

1. *Central Cities*. If the central cities did not receive special treatment, the system would indicate that all projects proposed for Minneapolis and St. Paul would receive top priority because of their high degree of development. However, because of the existing concentrations of low-income housing in these central cities, assigning them a high priority would be contrary to the objective of increasing

diversity of locational choice throughout the region. Therefore, subsidized housing units are only allocated to these central cities to provide replacement housing for urban renewal projects and other public action, and to remain eligible for federal assistance.

2. *New Towns and Planned Unit Developments.* Due to the problems of land assembly and costs, these developments often occur in the areas generally classified as having low priority for development although utilities, services and amenities are included as parts of a comprehensive development plan. Therefore, in order to support these approaches, it is necessary to give such proposals higher priority apart from their general priority classification.[65]

Intra-Subarea Allocations

The two numerical approaches previously described offer methods of allocating units to fairly large geographical areas which offer a great variety of site locations. Intra-subarea plans have been formulated to provide further guidelines for the distribution of low- and moderate-income housing within the subareas, for the local planning agencies, private developers and sponsors in selecting sites for new units. This aspect of the plan is used after the total number of units or percentages have been allocated to the subareas by the major model. These plans are a combination of the numerical strategies and the priority strategies. Once the first phase of the plan allocates a number or percentage of low-income housing units to a subarea, the second phase establishes priorities for the neighborhoods within the subarea. Intra-subarea distribution models have been formulated by the

Sacramento Regional Area Planning Commission and the San Bernardino County Planning Department.[66]

Intra-subarea Plans divide the subareas into smaller units. Sacramento used census tracts because of the availability of data on that basis.[67] San Bernardino viewed the neighborhood as the basic community unit in which people identify. Therefore, the areas chosen, which most closely identified these neighborhoods, and for which data were available, were the elementary school service areas.[68]

The criteria selected for intra-subarea strategies reflect neighborhood characteristics, for the purpose of determining the most suitable neighborhood within a particular subarea for the development of low-income housing. Sacramento and San Bernardino have used similar criteria in developing intra-subarea models. The criteria chosen by Sacramento are:[69]

1. *Existing Subsidized Units.* This variable was used to decrease concentration of low-income housing and to increase diversity of choice for low-income families.

2. *Access to Transit.* Because of the limited mobility of many low-income families, public transit is vital in extending their access to jobs.

3. *Land Availability.* The amount of vacant land in an area is used as an index of land availability and cost. The size of the census tract as a percentage of the total study area acreage indirectly indicated the availability of undeveloped land.

4. *Jobs.* Consideration is given to locating people near their

place of employment which is a reflection of preference and convenience.

5. *Excess School Capacity*. This factor reflects a neighborhood's ability to absorb additional population without excessive expenditure for facilities.

6. *Community Development*. Special consideration is given to existing and proposed renewal areas and the need for subsidized housing programs for their completion.

The chosen criteria are then weighted in the following manner.

I.	EXISTING SUBSIDIZED UNITS	
	Subsidized units within the tract	1
	Subsidized units bordering the tract	3
	No subsidized units in the tract	5
II.	ACCESS TO TRANSIT	
	No transit in the tract	1
	Transit bordering the tract	3
	Transit in the tract	5
III.	SIZE OF CENSUS TRACT AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE URBAN, RURAL OR MARYSVILLE-YUBA CITY AREA	
	0-10%	1
	10-15%	2
	15% and Over	3
IV.	JOBS	
	No job center in the tract	1
	Job centers along the border of the tract	3
	Job center within the area	5
V.	EXCESS SCHOOL CAPACITY	
	No capacity for additional students	1
	1-20% capacity for additional students	3
	20% and over capacity for additional students	5
VI.	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	
	No community development in tract	1
	Community development bordering tract	3
	Community development in tract	5

For each of the six criteria, a score from 1 (poor) to 5 (good) is given and a point rating for each intra-subarea is calculated. Intra-subareas with high scores are deemed desirable for low-income housing, while areas with low scores should be avoided. This strategy is intended to give local jurisdictions a means by which to review a specific site in conjunction with the regional distribution approach.[70]

Designating Specific Sites

The fifth strategy of distributing low-income housing throughout a metropolitan region is to designate specific future housing sites. This strategy is being used in Fulton County, Georgia. A Federal District Court ordered the dispersal of public housing in areas outside of Atlanta's present concentration of low-income housing, most of which is in eight of Atlanta's 132 square miles. The areas for dispersal were the areas which lie both within the unincorporated sections of Fulton County and the jurisdiction of the Atlanta Housing Authority, and the City of Atlanta, rather than the five-county Atlanta Region.[71]

The Court ordered the plan to be carried out in two stages. The first stage of the plan involved identifying general areas in which low-rent housing would be appropriate. The second stage involved identifying specific sites within the general areas suitable for low-income housing.[72] Three sites were recommended in each general area to provide the local housing authority more flexibility in acquiring sites.[73]

The location criteria considered in selecting these general areas and specific locations were:

1. Adequacy of public services, such as schools, parks, libraries, health care centers and fire protection.

2. The availability of sewers within the next five years.

3. Accessibility of commercial areas and employment centers.

4. Availability of public transportation.

5. Compatability with land use plans.[74]

Unlike the other four strategies, there was not a quantitative weighting of each individual factor. Instead, each site was individually evaluated and considered on its own merits.

CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FORMULATING REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION PLANS

There is no one distribution plan which is appropriate for all metropolitan regions. All regions have their own particular characteristics, problems, and reasons for formulating a regional distribution plan for low-income housing.[75] However, three basic steps have been followed in formulating regional distribution plans for low-income housing, as previously described in Chapter II. These steps are: (1) designate subareas within the region; (2) select criteria and (3) develop a distribution strategy. Site selection policies should also be developed as a fourth basic step in formulating regional distribution plans. Guidelines for these basic steps are presented below in order to provide metropolitan regions "rules-of-thumb" in developing regional distribution plans for low-income housing.

Selecting Subareas

Although there have been different geographic areas used for subareas within various metropolitan regions, there are basic guidelines which should be followed in formulating subareas. Subareas should (1) correspond with political boundaries; (2) provide a sound data base, and (3) be of sufficient size to offer alternative sites to construct the low-income housing units.

1. Planning subareas should correspond with political boundaries. Utilizing political units as subareas provides the clearest delineation of responsibility for providing the low-income housing units which are to be allocated. The Director of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Council stated that, "I don't see how we can implement the plan unless it relates to political units."[76] Bucks County's Planning Department stated that whichever political unit has zoning and subdivisions powers should be used, otherwise the responsibility is not clear.[77] The relationship between land-use controls and low-income housing is discussed in Chapter IV.

2. The subareas selected should provide a sound data base for the criteria which are to be selected. Subareas which do not correspond with a sound data base will often result in an inaccurate allocation model. Such a model will also be difficult to update. Miami Valley uses townships partly because their boundaries are constant and data are available for them.[78]

3. Subareas should be large enough to offer alternative sites to provide the units. Subareas which are too small may not provide alternative sites, or may not provide any sites at all.[79] The size of the subarea will depend upon the level of development within the subareas and the availability of suitable sites for low-income housing.

Selecting Criteria

There are numerous criteria from which a region can select in formulating a distribution plan. Below are guidelines to follow in selecting these criteria.

1. The criteria selected should reflect the desired pattern of development and the objectives of the regional distribution plan. For example, if a major objective of the plan is to distribute low-income housing in relation to the distribution of employment in order to create a better jobs-housing balance, the location of job centers is a criterion which should be given major emphasis.

2. The criteria selected should reflect the ability of the subareas to fiscally and physically absorb the low-income housing units. Criteria which consider the school capacity or the fiscal resources of the subareas should be utilized.

3. The criteria selected should reflect the particular problems and neighborhood objections in the region. For example, if school crowding or increased school expenditures caused by the new families is a major concern, present school capacity and assessed value per pupil are criteria which should be emphasized, as was done in Miami Valley.

4. The criteria selected should reflect the suitability of subareas for low-income housing. The introduction of low-income housing could be detrimental to a subarea and the new residents if suitability criteria are not considered. If the necessary services for low-income housing, such as public transportation, job centers, and social services, are not available throughout the region, existing development or the actual or potential availability of particular services should be utilized as criteria.

5. Criteria which require subjective value judgements, such as the willingness of a subarea to accept subsidized housing, should not

be used. Subjective criteria may stimulate argument and jeopardize the entire plan.

6. The regional distribution plan must be periodically updated. Therefore, criteria for which current data are periodically available for all subareas in the region must be used.

7. Many criteria measure the same conditions. It is preferable to use a few pertinent criteria than many redundant criteria.

8. There is not a set of criteria which can be used in all metropolitan regions. However, certain criteria have been used more frequently than others. Table 7 indicates the most frequently used criteria for the sample of seven distribution plans compared in Table 5.

Table 7. Most Frequently Used Criteria

Criteria	Frequency
Present Location of Low-Income Families	5
Proportion to Population	5
Equal-Share	4
Local Jobs	4
Present Concentration of Low-Income Housing	3
Schools—Assessed Value	3
Schools—Overcrowding	3
Vacant Land	3

These criteria should all be considered in formulating regional distribution plans for low-income housing.

Selecting Strategies

A regional planning agency formulating a distribution plan for low-income housing has several basic strategies and combinations of strategies from which to select. Table 8 evaluates the five basic strategies described in Chapter II. It should be noted that these strategies are not mutually exclusive.

The conditions in each particular region should be evaluated prior to selecting a strategy. The level of need and of development in the region must also be considered. Below are guidelines to follow in selecting a strategy.

1. Regions with widespread need and which are highly developed should select a numerical strategy (a strategy based on need or federally subsidized units allocated). Numerical strategies are also preferable in regions with the necessary supportive facilities located throughout most of the region. Utilizing these strategies, all local jurisdictions in the region, which accept the plan, can be held responsible for accepting their "fair-share." These strategies encourage development in all areas of the region where a need exists and which are suitable for low-income housing. The burden is placed on the localities dispersed throughout the region, rather than with a few developers or sponsors. The advantages and disadvantages of the different numerical strategies are described in Table 8.

Table 8. Evaluation of Distribution Strategies

Strategy	Advantages of Strategy	Disadvantages of Strategy
NEED	1. Presents most accurate account of housing need, reality of problem is in full view, Congress and HUD are forced to realize that more significant measures must be taken if housing problem is to be solved. 2. Each subarea can be held responsible for accepting its "fair share" of units. 3. Sets upper limit on the number of units a subarea can receive.	1. Difficult to encourage developers to choose areas where housing is *most* needed, since developers can locate units in any subarea with unused allocations, in order to comply with plan. 2. Distribution based on need cannot be realistically fulfilled with present level of low-income housing funding.
FEDERALLY-SUBSIDIZED UNITS ALLOCATED	1. Gives indication of how much need can be met. 2. Represents truest account of the actual number of units to be dispersed to each subarea. 3. Each subarea can be held responsible for accepting its "fair share" of units. 4. Upper limit can be set on the number of units a subarea can receive.	1. Difficult to determine the number of subsidized units available, in advance. 2. Difficult to encourage developers to choose areas where housing is *most* needed, since developers can locate units in any subarea with unused allocations, in order to comply with plan.

Table 8. Continued

Strategy	Advantages of Strategy	Disadvantages of Strategy
PRIORITY	1. Less rigid and, therefore, easier to sell to local officials.[73] 2. Areas with *most* need are given highest priority for low-income housing units. 3. More responsibility on developers to comply with plan and to build in priority areas.[74]	1. No definite measurement in a priority plan to determine how subareas are complying with the plan. 2. No responsibility on jurisdictions to accept a "fair-share" of units. 3. No upper limit for number of units received in a subarea. 4. Possibility of a high priority subarea being overburdened with units.
INTRA-SUBAREAS (USED IN TANDEM WITH EITHER OF PRECEDING STRATE-GIES)	1. Provides further guide-lines for local plan-ning agencies, developers and sponsors in selecting sites. 2. Reduces possibility of overburdening neighbor-hood services. 3. Greater assurances site will have the necessary services and facilities.	1. Most complicated to understand. 2. More open to questions of validity because of another set of criteria and calculations.
SPECIFIC SITES	1. Greater assurance the site has the necessary services and facilities.	1. Unnecessary increase in residential fear because all sites selected may not be acquired.[75] 2. Possibility that the site will be rezoned for a dif-ferent use prior to land acquisition.

2. Regions unable to disperse the low-income housing units through much of the region, because of inadequate services outside the central city, should use a priority strategy. Certain areas are designated to develop low-income housing units before other areas. Priority strategies are, therefore, best suited for areas of rapid development, which do not have the necessary auxiliary services in much of the region.[83]

Priority plans place the major responsibility for implementation on the developer rather than the locality. This approach allows for more direct implementation since the agency can indicate to the developers and sponsors of subsidized housing, the priority areas on which to focus their attention.[84]

3. Intra-subarea strategies should be used in tandem with either of the previously described strategies. This strategy provides the necessary location guidelines on the neighborhood level to assure that the neighborhood selected for development won't be overburdened and that the necessary services will be available. Because of the wide range of neighborhoods in most subareas, many of which are not suitable for low-income housing, this stage is essential.

4. The specific site strategy should not be utilized unless the sites to be developed can be acquired in advance. The disadvantages of this strategy heavily outweigh the advantages. However, regional planning agencies should establish policies for selecting specific sites.

Selecting Specific Sites

Site selection policies should be included in regional distribution plans to evaluate specific sites within the subareas. A sound policy for selecting sites is necessary to insure a suitable location for the housing units, and to explain to the public why one site was selected over another. The site selected will directly affect the goals and objectives of the distribution plan. For example, the site selected will determine whether integration of the housing units within a community occurs or whether the units are located in an isolated setting. The site selected will also determine whether the low-income families will live in a decent living environment.

Below is a list of factors which a region can select from in evaluating specific sites. The factors selected should reflect the region's goals, objectives, and desired pattern of development. The policy for selecting the sites should also be consistent with policies for residential land use within the region.

1. COST OF SITE (As Compared to Allowable Land Costs)
   Acquisition cost
   Site preparation cost

2. SITE CHARACTERISTICS
   Size of site
   Zoning
   Availability of utilities (water, electricity, gas, and sewer)
   Physical characteristics of the site

3. PROXIMITY OF SERVICES
   Public transportation
   Employment centers

Commercial uses (convenience shopping, supermarkets, regional shopping centers, bars, etc.)

Schools

Day care centers and nurseries

Health facilities (hospitals, outpatient clinics, drug stores)

Recreation facilities (parks, community social centers, cultural activities, etc.)

Community services (libraries, post office, public assistance office, churches, etc.)

4. SUITABILITY OF NEIGHBORHOOD

Outside areas of minority concentration

Compatability of surrounding land uses

Absence of air, noise and water pollution

Absence of environmental hazards (heavy industrial plants, etc.)

If there are several available sites within a subarea, they should be ranked and priorities should be established to select the sites, as was done in selecting the intra-subareas.

CHAPTER IV

IMPLEMENTATION

Methods for implementation must be formulated if the concept of distributing low-income housing throughout metropolitan areas is to be actualized. For the distribution approach to be implemented, it is necessary to develop full cooperation on the federal, state, regional, and local levels. Implementation requires the acceptance of responsibility at all levels, from the present suburban residents to the Federal Government.

Regional agencies do not have the power to force subsidized housing on any locality in order to implement the distribution plan. The distribution plan can only encourage local agencies and private sponsors to seek out sites in areas where there are unused allocations of the formula, or which are designated as top priority. The plan has to be publicized and be taken seriously by local governments, state housing authorities and HUD.

Implementation has taken place primarily through HUD decisions about proposed subsidized housing projects with the advice of the regional agency through the A-95 review process. The A-95 review process is an intergovernmental administrative device established by the Office of Management and Budget to insure compliance with federal legislation. Under these procedures, requests for federal funds must go through a regional clearinghouse for review and comment after the application has been submitted to HUD. The regional clearinghouse prepares its comments and recommendations and then transmits them back to HUD. This review process provides the opportunity to introduce regional planning objectives into HUD decisions. This review process is the primary implementation tool for a regional distribution plan. Requests from communities conforming to the distribution plan are given a favorable endorsement, while communities not conforming are given an unfavorable endorsement.

Only projects having more than 50 single-family units or 100 multi-family units are subject to such review. Small projects are therefore exempt from review. Nevertheless, A-95 review procedures have had a measurable effect on correcting the imbalance in the distribution of low-income housing in metropolitan regions.[85]

Obstacles to Implementation

The A-95 review process alone does not have the muscle to implement a concept as controversial as dispersing low-income housing. There have been numerous obstacles which have hindered the implementation of regional distribution plans for low-income housing. These obstacles were determined by a survey which is described below.

Survey of Obstacles

A survey was conducted to quantify and rank the frequency and severity of obstacles to implementing a regional distribution plan for low-income housing. The survey of obstacles was a major element in the survey previously described in Chapter I.

Methodology

Surveys were mailed to 19 planning agencies involved with the distribution of low-income housing in metropolitan regions. Appendix B lists the agencies surveyed and the status of their plans.

Eleven items were listed which might be an obstacles to implementation. For each of these items, or any "other" obstacles, the respondent was requested to check one of the following:

1. No obstacle is anticipated or has occurred.
2. Obstacle has occurred.
3. Obstacle is anticipated to occur.

If one of the latter two situations was checked, the respondent was requested to evaluate the severity of the obstacle (severe, moderate, or minimal). To rank these obstacles as to overall severity, the following number of points are assigned to each degree of severity:

SEVERE - 3 Points

MODERATE - 2 Points

MINIMAL - 1 Point

The items with the most total points are rated as the more severe obstacles to implementing a regional distribution plan.

Results

Of the 19 surveys mailed, 13 were returned completed, two respondents replied, stating that the agency had not made sufficient progress to complete the survey, and four agencies did not reply at all.

Table 9 ranks the frequency of the obstacles which have most often occurred or are anticipated to occur. Table 10 ranks the severity

Table 9. Frequency of Obstacles to Implementing Distribution Plans

Obstacle	No Obstacle Has Occurred or is Anticipated (A)	Obstacle Has Occurred (B)	Obstacle is Anticipated to Occur (C)	Total Obstacle Has Occurred or is Anticipated to Occur (B + C)
1. Resistance by adjoining property owners.	0	10	3	13
2. High cost of land in suburbs.	2	7	4	11
3. Commitment of local officials to a policy of distributing low-income housing.	3	7	3	10
4. Inadequate public transportation.	3	5	5	10
5. Restrictive zoning practices.	3	4	6	10
6. Inadequate social services.	3	4	6	10
7. Overcrowding of schools.	5	4	4	8
8. Inadequate health services.	6	3	4	7
9. HUD moratorium*	-	4	2	6
10. Commitment of HUD to a policy of distributing low-income housing.	8	3	2	5
11. Commitment of state to a policy of distributing low-income housing.	8	1	4	5
12. Local referendums.	11	2	0	2

*HUD moratorium was a write-in. Since 44 per cent of the respondents considered the moratorium an obstacle, it is assumed that its frequency would have been higher if it had been included directly on the questionnaire.

Table 10. Severity of Obstacles to Implementing Distribution Plans

Obstacle	Total Number of Points
1. Resistance by the adjoining property owners	31
2. High cost of land in suburbs	26
3. Restrictive zoning practices	24
4. Commitment of local officials to a policy of distributing low-income housing	23
5. Inadequate public transportation	21
6. HUD moratorium*	18
7. Inadequate social services	17
8. Overcrowding of schools	14
9. Commitment of HUD to a policy of distributing low-income housing	12
10. Inadequate health services	12
11. Commitment of state to a policy of distributing low-income housing	10
12. Local referendums	5

*HUD moratorium was a write-in. Since all respondents designating the HUD moratorium considered it severe, it is assumed that its severity would have been higher if included directly on the questionnaire.

of these obstacles. Only items designated as an obstacle at least twice are included in these tables. The complete survey results are contained in Appendix C.

Analysis of Obstacles

The most severe obstacles to implementing a regional distribution plan for low-income housing, as determined by the survey results, are described below. The obstacles are described in the order of their severity. Following a description of each obstacle are recommended policies, programs and legislation to assist in overcoming each respective obstacle in order to facilitate the implementation of regional distribution plans for low-income housing.

Resistance by Adjoining Property Owner

Neighborhood resistance is the principal barrier to the dispersal of low-income housing. The survey results indicated that the attitudes and fears of the general citizenry is the most frequently cited obstacle and, in addition, is the most severe obstacle to implementing distribution plans for low-income housing. Although many people agree that more low-income housing is needed, residents of an area where such housing is proposed invariably seem to object.

The recent study conducted in Dayton, Ohio, attempted to ascertain the overt reasons why low- and moderate-income groups were perceived as threatening. A survey was conducted, in which suburban residents were asked to indicate the importance of reasons frequently given for objecting to the provision of low-income housing in higher income communities. The respondents were also encouraged to specify any other reasons for their belief that these households would be harmful to their neighborhood. The results are shown in Table 11.[86]

Table 11. Reasons for Considering Low/Moderate-Income Households Undesirable Neighbors[79] (In Percentage)

Reasons	Very Important	Important	Un-important	No Answer
Property values would drop.	55	29	9	7
Property taxes would increase due to need for increased services.	36	31	26	7
Neighborhood would face a drop in social status.	31	32	30	7
Neighborhood would become less stable.	40	43	9	7
Those people would not fit in with rest of community.	29	37	25	8
Housing maintenance and conditions would decrease.	59	23	9	8
Decrease in law and order.	43	30	20	7
Change in character of neighborhood with shopping facilities catering to new group's needs.	19	34	40	7
Drop in quality of schools.	38	18	40	7
These people would be a bad influence on my family because they don't believe the same thing we do.	15	23	54	8
OTHER:				
Race.	2			
Low-income persons would feel insecure in higher-income areas.	1			
Low-income households have too many children.	1			

Recommendations to Reduce Neighborhood Resistance. Suburban residents fear that the inclusion of low-income housing in their neighborhood will lower the social, physical, and public service benefits they presently enjoy, and will simultaneously cause property value to decrease. The surveys conducted in Dayton concluded that the inclusion of programs to preserve or enhance the features of the environment that the suburbanites fear may be harmed by the low- and moderate-income families dramatically increase the acceptability of the incoming groups.[87] Therefore, auxiliary programs should be designed to reduce any negative impacts low-income housing will have on suburban neighborhoods. The following recommendations should be incorporated into the distribution plan:

A. In order to allay some of the fears of local residents, a distribution plan should establish upper limits to the number of subsidized units that can go into any one subarea. The City of St. Louis recently adopted a policy of limiting the quantity of subsidized housing in most subareas of the city to 5 per cent of the total number of units.[88] The Dayton Plan set an upper limit on the number of low-income units any one subarea would be required to absorb. Each subarea complying with the plan, must be assured that once it has accepted its "fair-share", they won't be required to accept an additional burden.

B. Regional agencies should include policies to prevent the future concentration of low-income housing in their distribution plans. Such policies are useful in reducing neighborhood fear and in preventing large projects which have historically compounded the problems of poverty. Regional planning agencies should establish the following policies:

1. Policies should be established in regard to the maximum number of low-income housing units allowed at each site. The Joint Committee for Selection of Public Housing Sites, in Atlanta, Georgia, stated that between 50 and 100 low-income housing units at each site is a desirable limit.[89] San Bernardino County's distribution plan stated that no development shall have more than 40 government-subsidized units.[90] Projects should be small enough to be able to fit into the neighborhood and not appear as an isolated unit. Large projects become identified as "minority housing" or "poor peoples housing" and generate an undesirable attitude toward the project and the residents.

   In formulating policies regarding the number of units at each site, it must be noted that it is less economically feasible to include community facilities, such as meeting rooms, day care centers, and parks in smaller projects, than in large projects. Federal regulations establish a ratio between the total number of subsidized units and the money available for the construction of community facilities. Therefore, if low-income housing units are dispersed in small projects, the space allowed for community facilities may be too small to be functional.

There are two methods by which community facilities can be provided in small scattered projects. The first method is increased Federal spending for community facilities in small scattered projects. The second method is to locate low-income housing in areas which already have the necessary community facilities.

2. Policies should also be established concerning the distance between projects. San Bernardino incorporates a spacing formula in their plan. All subsidized projects are to be separated from each other by a spacing radius equal to 50 feet per dwelling unit in the project. The radius emanates from the peripheral boundary of the project and the distance between projects is established by tangent radii.[91] For example, two subsidized projects of 60 units and 45 units each should be separated by tangent radii of 3,000 feet and 2,250 feet, respectively, or a total of approximately one mile.

The above policies to control the concentration of low-income housing units should be flexible. In subareas where suitable land is scarce and a deficiency of low-income housing exists, these policies should be modified to recognize the housing need, while still attempting to avoid unnecessary concentrations of low-income housing.

C. The criteria selected for allocating the housing units should reflect the legitimate fears of the suburbanites. The suburbanites fear that the inclusion of low-income housing in their neighborhood will increase property taxes due to the need for increased services. The net fiscal effects in the community will actually be determined by the degree to which the new residents cause expansion in the capital and operating costs of the services already being provided. As an extreme example, if the new residents can be serviced by the existing public work force without any addition in hours worked and can be handled by the physical capacity of the existing capital facilities, then they would not cause the property tax rate to increase.[92] Dayton's distribution plan considered this concept by selecting criteria which considered the impact on schooling. The plan carefully considered the present condition of the school system, by selecting two criteria related to the ability of the school system to absorb additional students. Such an approach in selecting criteria minimizes the possibility of a financial burden caused by the new residents.

D. In order to make a start in dispersing low-income inner-city families, housing should first be provided for low-income residents who already work in the outer city. The suburbanites would respond better to residents they are already familiar with and do not fear as a class, the way they fear the urban poor in general.[93]

E. Regional agencies should engage in educational programs aimed at answering suburban questions and concerns. The Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission engaged in an extensive public education effort to overcome neighborhood objections. Public hearings should be held throughout the region at times and places convenient to everyone. At these hearings, the citizens should be allowed to respond to the various aspects of the plan as they affect their particular community.

Below are several of the subjects which should be explained to the public:

1. The need for new low-income housing should be explicitly explained to the suburbanites. This should be accomplished with charts, graphs, and other audio/visual aids.[94]

2. The suburbanites should be educated as to the role they play in perpetuating the problems of the central city. For example, a consciousness of the jobs-housing imbalance should be created. The concept of a jobs-housing imbalance is completely new to most citizens and every effort should be made to publicize it.[95]

3. The appearance of the housing should be explained. Citizens are often surprised to find out that such housing can be attractively designed.

4. The housing plan and the rationale behind it should be explained in layman terms.

5. It should be explained to the management of suburban corporations that locating low-income housing closer to employment will increase the productivity of the worker.[96]

6. The public should be informed of how the plan affects them. Such questions as school enrollment, property taxes, should be anticipated with adequate data.[97] It should also be explained to the suburbanites that suburban integration need not destroy the present character of their neighborhood.

7. Planning agencies should level with the public. The Miami Valley staff has advocated this position as one of fairness and respect for the public.[98]

The following legislation and programs should be adopted to supplement the region's distribution plan:

F. Federal and/or state legislation should be adopted to provide grants to jurisdictions which are accepting low-income housing, to assist them in providing the necessary services for the new residents and their neighbors. These "impact-grants" would insure the locality that they will not have an extra tax burden because of increased services. Of particular importance is financial assistance to schools where new pupils will be absorbed.

G. Whether the subsidized housing units will contribute to the tax base of the community will depend upon the housing program being used. Public housing units are exempt from the property tax and the in-lieu-of-tax payments that the housing authority is allowed to make represent a small fraction of the tax payments a privately owned unit of similar value would provide. Newer programs, such as 235 and 236, have minimized this deficiency. State and/or federal housing programs should be developed and selected by regional agencies which pay full property tax. The danger of a financial burden will then be lessened.[99]

Another approach would be a program of state reimbursements to localities of a portion of tax abatements granted for low-income housing. Connecticut presently has a policy of tax-loss reimbursements.

H. Many suburban residents fear that their property values will decrease with the introduction of low-income housing. Prices will drop only if supply begins to climb faster than demand. This situation occurs when suburban residents regard the arrival of the first housing project as a disaster to be avoided at all costs. Many properties will probably be offered for sale at the same time, and if few or no families with equal purchasing power are willing to move into the area, and if the demand from low-income families is not sufficient to promptly absorb the homes for sale, the market will be glutted. The owners in their anxiety to leave, will accept "sacrifice prices" to attract a sufficient demand. For this outcome to occur, a "panic flight" psychological state must exist on the part of the present residents. There must also be a housing market with a large availability of alternatives.[100]

Therefore, the introduction of low-income housing in the areas outside the central city will cause property values to decrease only if the present residents start to leave and no other buyers or renters with equal purchasing power seek to buy or rent in their place. Property values will not decrease if people with the same purchasing power as the present residents continue to seek homes there.

Programs should be established to assure the suburban residents that they will not suffer a loss in property values. The state and/or the federal government should agree to buy all homes within a specified distance of the housing site, should the market price decrease. Such a program would reduce suburban flight before any possible decrease in property values and consequently prevent a self-fulfilling prophecy from occurring. However, such a program would receive severe opposition due to government intervention in private enterprise.

I. Suburban residents fear that housing maintenance will decrease with the introduction of low-income housing. Housing programs should, therefore, be established which guarantee high levels of maintenance.

J. The chief revenue source of local governments is the property tax. Low-income housing locating in a suburban community, causing a possible drain on the community's tax base, is considered an unwelcome neighbor by many suburbanites. Low-income housing does not add to the tax rolls the same amount of assessed value as luxury housing and it often brings large families into a neighborhood.[101] Legislation should be adopted to distribute the property tax base over broader geographic areas, such as the region or the state. Therefore, all communities would share any cost of serving the lower-income citizens. A regional or state tax base that would at least cover the cost of education would offset the fear among residents that opening up the community to low-income families would burden schools and push taxes up.

High Cost of Land in Suburbs

High land costs is considered the second most frequent and severe obstacle to implementing a regional distribution plan, according to the survey results. Raw land represents the fastest rising element of all major housing costs.

The price of land has approximately doubled in major metropolitan areas of the United States between 1950 and 1965. In areas of particularly rapid growth, the price has gone up five-fold in the same period. Within most metropolitan areas, the cost of land tends to rise as one approaches the center of the central city. Although central city land is more expensive than suburban land, the difference is becoming significantly less pronounced.[102]

The costs allowed by HUD for developing subsidized housing varies upon the locality, program being used, "reasonableness," and the amount of funds available.[103] The average land cost for FHA multi-family projects (236 and rent supplement) in Metropolitan Atlanta is \$946 per unit.[104] HUD has allowed slightly higher land costs for conventional public housing. These land costs limitations, coupled with skyrocketing land costs have resulted in a major obstacle to locating low-income housing in suitable locations outside the central city. For example, the Southeastern Regional Administrator of HUD recently stated that high land costs may block the dispersal of public housing into predominantly white northside Atlanta.[105]

Recommendations to Reduce Land Costs. In order to increase the supply of reasonably-priced land at suitable locations, state legislation should be adopted authorizing regional agencies to create land acquisition programs. A land acquisition or banking program can hold down the overall rise in housing costs brought about by the continuing escalation of the price of raw land. A land-banking operation for the purpose of providing sites for the future development of low-income housing is an effective method of controlling land costs. A land-banking operation can make land available for low-income housing when and where the land is needed.[106]

A regional land acquisition agency would acquire the site by direct negotiation and purchase, eminent domain or donation. The quantity and location of all sites selected by the acquisition agency would correspond with the distribution plan and site selection policy. Parcels would be acquired in advance to make sites available to private developers, non-profit sponsors and public agencies who are willing to develop low-income housing in accordance with the distribution plan. The land would be conveyed to the developer complying with the plan at "written down" or less-than-market prices to create an incentive for developers to comply with the plan. Utilization of this approach would necessitate the use of a distribution plan which would designate the quantity and location of sites in a subarea, several years in advance.

Restrictive Zoning Practices

The basic purpose of zoning is to promote the health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the population. However, zoning practices have often been used for other purposes. Richard Babcock stated that, "Zoning has provided the device for protecting the homogeneous single family suburb from the city."[107]

Most localities within metropolitan regions have complete autonomy in their exercise of zoning powers, which are delegated to them by the State. Of the 7,609 local governments within metropolitan areas, approximately 5,200, or 68 per cent, have a zoning ordinance in force. Within the New York City Metropolitan Area, more than 500 jurisdictions are exercising zoning powers.[108] Localities have not been required to cite regional conditions in formulating these zoning ordinances, although regional issues are involved.

Most local ordinances are above the minimum needed to achieve health, safety and some minimum of amenity.[109] Zoning has often been used by localities "to zone out social or fiscal undesirables."[110] The zoning ordinances in most suburban localities provide for an excessive amount of large acre lots. For example, 48 per cent of the vacant land zoned for residential use in the New York City Metropolitan Area, excluding New York City, required residential lots of one acre or more in 1960. In Westchester County, a suburb of New York City, 78 per cent of such land was zoned for parcels of one acre or more.[111] The zoning practices in the area outside of New York City are typical of many metropolitan areas throughout the country. It is not economically possible to build low-income housing on lots zoned at these densities. Large lot sizes add to the initial cost of the land and add increased utility and support service costs. In addition, the scarcity of land zoned for multi-family housing has escalated the costs of land available for these purposes. Increasing housing costs above the minimum have excluded people who would like to live in the outer city but cannot presently afford to do so.

Restrictive zoning ordinances in most suburban communities are varied downward only for these developers who the local leaders are confident will be properly selective in determining future residents.[112] Rezoning for subsidized housing has been very difficult to obtain. Paul Davidoff recently said that restrictive zoning has been

> remarkably effective in preventing low and moderate income families from penetrating suburban housing and land markets, in greatly limiting the matching of jobs and workers in urban areas, and in raising the cost of new homes in the suburbs to all homeseeking families. If this nation is to provide for the housing and job needs of its minority citizens, the power of government must be used to break the land use barriers erected by suburban communities. This challenge may soon be recognized as the new frontier of the civil rights movement.[113]

Restrictive Zoning was ranked as the fifth most frequent obstacle, and the third most severe obstacle in implementing a regional distribution plan for low-income housing.

Recommendations for Overcoming Restrictive Zoning Practices. Zoning ordinances should not prohibit the development of low-income housing in any way over and above the regulations of other residential land uses. Low-income housing developers should be given the same opportunity for rezoning and other zoning permissions as the developers of higher income residential developments. Zoning, as applied to low-income housing, should only serve the purpose that it was originally intended to serve--to promote the health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the population.

There are four basic approaches which can be taken in overcoming restrictive zoning practices, in addition to applying standards similar to those applied toward other types of residential development. These approaches are (A) court litigation; (B) changes in the zoning enabling legislation; (C) changes in the local tax system; and (D) combining the zoning process with the tax system.

A. *Court Litigation.* The courts can be an effective agent in overcoming restrictive zoning ordinances with respect to low-income housing. Zoning litigation has advanced the housing interests of individual and group plaintiffs in a large number of instances, although no case to date has gained relief for the entire class of inner-city residents excluded from the suburbs. This approach adds the much needed publicity, demonstrates the legitimacy of the issues and has the possibility of making law.[114] However, the courts should not be relied upon to substitute for the planning that should occur prior to implementation.

The courts have given credence to the concept that a zoning ordinance must consider region housing needs. On October 28, 1971, the Superior Court of Middlesex County, New Jersey, struck down the entire zoning ordinance of Madison Township on the ground that it prohibited 90 per cent of the metropolitan population from obtaining housing in the township. Judge Furman found that such economic discrimination was not in the general welfare of the citizens of the State of New Jersey and, therefore, violated the constitutional standards for zoning embodied in the New Jersey Zoning Enabling Act. The judge stated:

> Housing needs are encompassed within the general welfare . . . In pursuing the valid purpose of a balanced community, a municipality must not ignore housing needs, that is, its fair proportion of the obligation to meet the housing needs of its own

> population and of the region . . . general welfare does not stop at each municipal boundary. . . . The exclusionary approach in the ordinances under attack coincides in time with desparate housing needs in the county and region and expanding programs, federal and state for subsidized housing for low income families.[115]

B. *Changes in the Zoning Enabling Legislation.* Several possible legislative changes are described below.

1. Minimum Percentage of Land Area Zoned for Low-Income Housing. This procedure would require every municipality to zone a minimum fixed percentage of its developed land area for low-income housing. Massachusetts adopted such legislation in 1969. Under this legislation, guidelines instruct all municipalities to allow 1.5 per cent of their total land area, minus publicly-owned land, for low-income housing.[116]

   There are several problems with this approach. Most jurisdictions will stick to the minimum, even when larger quantities are appropriate, necessary and fiscally possible. A minimum land area percentage which is too high will burden some jurisdictions. A minimum too small will produce only token results and will not meet the total region needs in most instances. It is more feasible to require communities to zone an amount of its land for low-income housing in proportion to what it can afford. This concept will be further described in this chapter.

2. State or Federal Preemption of Zoning Power. Another legislative solution to restrictive zoning is to authorize

the State or Federal government to override local zoning ordinances which exclude low-income housing. Massachusetts and New York, through the State Urban Development Corporation, have established mechanisms for overriding local zoning. However, the New York State Legislature recently passed a measure stripping the UDC of its power to override local zoning ordinances in towns and villages. The Assistant to the President of the New York State Urban Development Corporation previously stated that, "Although this power has never been exercised without a locality's express or implicit approval, it is always in the wings to 'facilitate' negotiations."[117]

The Presidents Committee on Urban Housing recommended the Federal pre-emption of local zoning ordinances for Federally-subsidized housing. The report recommended that limited power be granted to the Secretary of HUD to pre-empt local zoning codes from application to Federally-subsidized low- and moderate-housing projects, subject to veto by the Governor of the State.[118]

These procedures are politically difficult to implement in view of the escalating demands for local control and citizen participation in the planning process, which the pre-emption of local zoning contradicts. The difficulty has been confirmed by the Urban Development Corporation which has met vigorous opposition to its powers by localities and the New York State Legislature.

3. Zoning Appeal. State legislation could establish zoning commissions to which aggrieved parties could appeal local zoning ordinances and rulings. Massachusetts' "anti-snob" zoning bill established an administrative appellate process for developers excluded from building low-income housing by local governmental units. The applicant for rezoning may appeal to a housing appeals committee of the Massachusetts Department of Community Affairs, if he is denied a permit or if he feels the conditions are excessive.[119]

4. Upward Transfer of Zoning Power. The most drastic approach to overcome restrictive zoning would be to entirely withdraw the zoning power from the municipal level and restore it to the state or transfer it to county or regional bodies. Restoring the zoning power to the state would meet political opposition. Localities have insisted on controlling the zoning function, especially in view of the local property tax system. Transferring the zoning process to the counties would in many cases result in zoning decisions as fiscally oriented and exclusionary as those of its component municipalities.[120] Transferring the zoning process to the regional agencies would result in the most responsive decision making.

5. Zoning Ordinances Requiring Low-Income Housing. A zoning

amendment in Fairfax County, Virginia, requires that all new housing developments in Fairfax County have a low-income housing component. However, the local courts recently ruled that the county does not have the enabling legislation to enforce the requirements, and enforcement has been suspended pending appeal to the Virginia Supreme Court. Montgomery County, Maryland, is proposing a similar amendment.[121]

The Fairfax County ordinance required that all residential planned communities, residential planned unit developments, planned apartment developments and multi-family districts (except high-rises), be developed with a minimum of 15 per cent low- and moderate-income housing. Of this, at least 40 per cent, or 6 per cent of the total shall be low-income housing. The developer would only be excused if Federal subsidies were not available.

To make the zoning amendment economically feasible, a density bonus of one unit for each two units of low- and moderate-income housing would be given to the developer. In addition, developments of 50 units or less and single family districts would be exempted. The applicant would be allowed to locate the units in a suitable area other than the area which is the subject of the rezoning application, provided the County finds the substitution will not result in an undue concentration of low- and moderate-income families in a particular geographical area.[122] This ordinance is an excellent method for dispersing low- and moderate-income housing throughout a metropolitan region, while developing communities with mixed incomes.

C. *Change in the Local Tax System.* Many of the exclusionary zoning ordinances have been enacted for fiscal reasons. Excessive amounts of land are zoned for non-residential use in the hope of attracting tax-producing ratables, and densities are kept low to keep out child-producing families which may increase the school budget. Local governments' reliance on the property tax should be changed to a system which does not provide an incentive for fiscal zoning. As previously discussed, a regional or state tax base, which would at least cover the cost of education, would reduce the present incentive for fiscal zoning.

D. *Combining the Zoning Process with the Tax System.* Combining a jurisdiction's zoning process and their ability to fiscally absorb the units is the most feasible approach since the relationship between zoning decisions and a jurisdiction's fiscal resources is a significant reason for exclusionary zoning.[123] This method could require every community to zone a percentage of its land for higher densities and lower cost development in proportion to what it can afford. Existing non-residential ratables could be used as a measure of a jurisdiction's fiscal strength. Non-residential ratables provide local tax returns while another community is often paying to educate the children of their employees. Therefore, the larger the proportion of non-residential ratables in a jurisdiction, the greater should be its responsibility to house, serve and educate the corresponding population. Conversely, if a jurisdiction prefers to forego the fiscal advantages of non-residential development, it would not be compelled to bear the cost of high-intensity residential development.

This approach is politically feasible since it does not tamper with the principle of home rule or with the present tax system. It would also have a positive planning effect, since it would allocate land properly zoned in proportion to employment centers which is a commonly used criteria in regional distribution plans.

Commitment of Local Officials

The lack of a commitment by local officials to a policy of distributing low-income housing was rated as the third most frequent and fourth most severe obstacle to implementing a regional distribution plan. Surveys conducted in Dayton, Ohio, indicate that most public officials are willing to encourage those housing programs which would take care of the low- and moderate-income households within their community. However, they are quite adverse to facilitating plans that would encourage lower-income households living elsewhere in the region to migrate into their community.[124]

Recommendations to Overcome Local Officials' Objections. Most of the recommendations previously described concerning neighborhood objections also apply to overcoming the objections of local officials. Education should be emphasized in overcoming this obstacle. The Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission has attempted to overcome the resistance of local officials through an educational program in order that local officials might better understand the programs, what their effects will be and how to deal with them.[125]

Inadequate Services

Inadequate public transportation, social services, schools, and health services were all considered obstacles to implementing regional distribution plans. Of these services, the inadequacy of public transportation was considered the most frequent and severe obstacle. These supporting services are vital for low-income families moving out of the central city.

Recommendations for Overcoming Inadequate Services. Low-income housing should be developed in the more highly-developed subareas in the region, which already have many of the necessary public services. Regional distribution plans should emphasize criteria which allocates the units to subareas having sufficient services, such as public transportation and health and social services. The Twin Cities' priority plan for low-income housing placed heavy emphasis on existing development.

It should be noted that reliance on existing development in areas which are not highly developed will negate the possibility of dispersing the housing units outside of the central city or fringe areas. In these lesser developed regions, additional community services are needed as part of the region's total housing program. A possible source for these facilities is special revenue sharing, if enacted.

Lack of a Commitment by HUD and the Housing Moratorium

The lack of a commitment by HUD to a policy distributing low-income housing throughout metropolitan regions, and the recent HUD moratorium on subsidized housing programs are both obstacles according to the survey results. These two obstacles are interrelated since the lack of a commitment by HUD to a policy of distributing low-income housing was reflected, in part, by the housing moratorium.

HUD's major effort to encourage the dispersal of low-income housing has been the Project Selection Criteria, which gives priority to proposals outside of areas of minority concentration. HUD has also supported Miami Valley's and Washington, D.C., COG's distribution plans. In addition, the Justice Department filed suit against Black Jack, Missouri, charging that the community enacted a zoning ordinance designed to exclude a subsidized housing project. Nevertheless, the Nixon Administration has adopted a policy of restraint with regard to locating low-income housing outside the central city. In his June 11, 1971, Statement on Equal Housing Opportunity, President Nixon stated his administration would "not seek to impose economic integration upon an existing local jurisdiction; at the same time we will not countenance any use of economic measures as a subterfuge for racial discrimination."[126] George Romney, former Secretary of HUD, stated at a press conference on November 25, 1970,

> . . . as far as I'm concerned, a policy that involved forced integration of the suburbs or racial balance would fail; that it's not a sound policy; and this department is not undertaking a policy of racial balance or racial quotas or forced integration, or anything of that character.[127]

All respondents writing-in the HUD moratorium as an obstacle rated it as severe. These ratings indicate that the lack of Federally-subsidized housing eliminates any possible chances for implementation in most metropolitan regions. A regional distribution plan without any housing units to distribute is impotent.

Recommendations for Overcoming Federal Obstacle. If distribution plans for low-income housing are to be implemented, either the subsidized housing programs must be restored, new programs be provided, or new sources of subsidized housing must be created. Regional agencies should actively lobby for the creation of funding sources for the development of low-income housing. Lobbying should occur on the local, state, and federal levels.[128] Possible sources of funds for the development of low-income housing include the following:

A. *States*. State housing development programs could be formed similar to New York State's Urban Development Corporation. The Urban Development Corporation finances low- and moderate-income housing projects through the sale of tax-exempt bonds. They started, however, with $50 million worth of capital in the form of an interest-free loan from the state legislature.

The states could also provide long-term, below market interest rate mortgages to non-profit and limited dividend corporations for constructing low-income housing. Several states have already enacted state housing finance authorities for this purpose.

B. *Revenue Sharing*. Localities willing to implement the distribution plan should be encouraged to use special revenue-sharing funds, if such legislation is enacted, for the development of low-income housing. The regional agency should also encourage the State to assist in the implementation of the distribution plan by channelling part of their share of revenue-sharing funds for developing low-income housing, through the regional agency.

C. *Private Industry*. Legislation could be adopted requiring all major employers relocating or building a new factory, to provide housing for their low-income employees or prospective employees, in proximity to the job site or accessible to the site by convenient transportation. However, such a policy could provide motives for employers to locate elsewhere, where such legislation does not exist.

Lack of a State Commitment

The lack of a commitment to a policy of dispersing low-income housing, by the state was considered a relatively minor obstacle. However, with the increasing role of the states, a lack of a commitment by state governments could be a more severe obstacle in the future.

Recommendations to Overcome State Objections. There are two methods for overcoming state objections. The first method is active lobbying by the regional planning agency for state governments to support the distribution plan with funds for the development of low-income housing. The second method involves implementing the recommendations for overcoming neighborhood resistance in order to reduce the objections of state legislators.

Referendums

The Cleveland Planning Commission and the San Francisco Department of City Planning indicated that referendums are an obstacle to locating low-income housing in the outer city. April 26, 1971, the United States Supreme Court upheld a state regulation giving the people of cities and towns the right to block the construction of public housing by a referendum. Herbert M. Franklin, an executive associate for the National Urban Coalition said the ruling could speed the separation of metropolitan areas into black central cities and white suburbs.[129]

Recommendations for Overcoming Referendums. There are two methods for overcoming this obstacle. The first method is the adoption of legislation to prohibit referendums for the development of subsidized housing. The second method involves implementing the recommendations for overcoming neighborhood resistance. Only then will suburban residents not feel the need to vote against low-income housing projects.

Other Legislative Recommendations for Overcoming Obstacles

There is additional legislation which can assist in overcoming the obstacles to implementing a regional distribution plan for low-income housing, not directly related to a specific obstacle determined by the survey results. This legislation includes the following:

1. The planning and development of low-income housing has been divided among a variety of agencies without a coordinating structure responsive to overall housing needs. Regional housing agencies should be established for this purpose. Legislation should be adopted giving metropolitan agencies authority to receive and then assign funds for

low-income housing to the localities within its jurisdiction. Such legislation was proposed in Title V of the 1972 Housing and Urban Development Act which was defeated.[130] A major purpose of this Act was to establish metropolitan housing agencies and to authorize the financial and other assistance needed to enable these agencies to develop balanced housing programs on an areawide basis. The Act provided that metropolitan housing agencies would submit a three-year housing program which would:

a. establish housing needs, including the need to provide an adequate supply of standard housing for low- and moderate-income families within reasonable proximity to their place of employment with adequate supporting services.

b. establish objectives toward meeting these needs.

c. identify the number and types of housing units to be assisted with Federal subsidy funds.

d. identify the income groups to be served and the general location of the housing units to be made available to each group.

e. identify other local actions and programs to be undertaken to encourage needed housing production and preservation of the existing housing stock.

This Act authorized metropolitan agencies to receive funds to assist in carrying out programs designed to encourage the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families throughout the metropolitan area. Block grants to metropolitan housing agencies would be allocated among metropolitan areas pursuant to a formula based on population, amount of poverty, the amount of overcrowding and the extent of housing deficiencies in each metropolitan area. Grants would also include part of the cost to the jurisdictions within the metropolitan area of providing public facilities and services needed to serve additional housing units. Such legislation would give the regional agency formulating the distribution plan, the authority and the funding to implement the plan.

2. Legislation could be enacted to require the *approval* of the metropolitan agency for all state and federal housing subsidy funds within the area, rather than just requiring review and comment, as is the present situation under the A-95 review process.

3. A less drastic change, which would assist in implementing a distribution plan, would be to change the A-95 review process to include all subsidized housing projects. At present, the A-95 review process only includes projects containing at least 100 multi-family units or 50 single family units. Low-income housing projects dispersed in a small number of units are, therefore, exempt from this process.

4. The State and/or the Federal Government could enact legislation requiring the conformity to a regional distribution plan prior to receiving special revenue sharing funding.

5. State and/or Federal grants for various programs could be denied unless the jurisdiction provides low-income housing in accordance

with a regional distribution plan. Conversely, grants could be increased for those jurisdictions complying with the plan.

6. Legislation could be enacted requiring that no corporation hiring a significant number of workers can move to a new location in a suburban area where the housing market is closed to families earning what the workers in the plant will earn. Such legislation would mean that the tax benefits to a locality which accepts new industry will be balanced by the costs to that community of educating the worker's children, and providing them with municipal services.[131]

The National Commission on Urban Problems recommended that prior to final determination of any new Federal installation employing more than 50 persons in a metropolitan area, the locality must have an adequate amount of housing in or near the locality for persons of all income groups to be employed by the installation. In addition, no Federal contract would be entered into with a private firm for work to be undertaken at any factory, plant or other location employing more than 100 employees in an area which does not have adequate housing for employees of the plant or factory within a reasonable distance from the place of employment.[132]

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In most metropolitan regions, low-income housing has historically been located in the central city. This pattern should be altered to allow the low-income central city residents, desiring to live in the outer city, the opportunity to exercise that choice.

To adequately plan for the allocation of low-income housing throughout a metropolitan region, distribution plans should be formulated. These plans should either designate a "fair-share" of units to all subareas within the region which are suitable for low-income housing, or should assign priorities to the subareas for the development of these units. The designated allocations should not overburden any one subarea. The distribution plan should be updated annually and should consist of the following four elements:

A. Subareas within the region should be designated in order to form a geographic basis for the low-income housing units to be distributed. These subareas should be based on political units, a sound data base, and sufficient developable land.

B. Criteria, which are indexes of the subareas' characteristics and are used for apportioning the allocations, should be selected. The criteria selected should reflect the region's objectives, desired pattern of development, ability of the subareas to absorb the units, problems and neighborhood objections, and the suitability of the subareas for low-income housing.

C. A distribution strategy, which consists of the rationale and mechanics of the plan, should be developed. The five basic strategies studied are distribution based on (1) need; (2) the percentage of subsidized units allocated to the region; (3) priority areas; (4) intra-subarea priorities, once the subarea allocations have been designated; and (5) designating specific locations.

The first two strategies, which utilize numerical allocations, should be used when the need for low-income housing and subareas suitable for low-income housing, are spread throughout most of the region. These strategies apply to the more developed regions.

The priority strategy should be utilized in regions of rapid development, where dispersal is not suitable throughout much of the region. This strategy encourages development in areas of most need and areas most suitable for low-income housing.

Intra-subarea strategies should be used in tandem with each of the previous strategies. The use of this strategy insures that the individual neighborhoods will not be overburdened.

The strategy of specifying specific sites should not be used for distributing low-income housing because of the unnecessary increase in neighborhood fear and the possibility that the site will be rezoned for a different use prior to land acquisition.

D. A policy for site selection should be developed to insure a suitable location for low-income housing within the subarea.

Attempts to implement regional distribution plans for low-income housing have been and are anticipated to be thwarted by numerous obstacles. These obstacles include, in order of severity, neighborhood resistance, high land costs, restrictive zoning practices, lack of a commitment by local officials, inadequate auxiliary services, lack of a commitment by HUD, lack of a commitment by the state, and local referendums. Nevertheless, there are several methods of overcoming the numerous obstacles, as summarized below. These recommendations are divided between policies which should be adopted by the regional planning agency and programs and legislation which should be established by the Federal and/or the State government.

A. The regional planning agency should adopt the following policies to overcome the obstacles to implementing a regional distribution plan for low-income housing:

policies to establish upper limits to the number of low-income housing units each subarea will be required to absorb.

policies to prevent large concentrations of low-income housing at any one site or in any one neighborhood.

policies to select criteria which reflect the ability of the subarea to absorb the units.

policies to select criteria which reflect the availability of auxiliary services.

begin implementation by providing housing for individuals already working in the suburbs.

establish an educational program.

encourage municipalities and the state to use revenue-sharing funds for low-income housing.

actively lobby for a source of funds for the development of low-income housing support for the distribution plan.

B. The Federal and/or the State government should adopt the following legislation and establish the following programs to overcome the obstacles to implementation (several of these recommendations achieve the same objective, but are included to present alternatives):

provide "impact grants" to jurisdictions which accept low-income housing in accordance with the plan, to assist them in providing the necessary auxiliary services.

develop housing programs which pay full property tax to the locality.

reimburse the locality any tax abatement granted for low-income housing.

agree to buy all homes within a specified distance of the project, should the market price decrease.

establish housing programs which guarantee a high level of maintenance.

establish a regional or state tax base which would at least cover the cost of education.

establish land banks to reduce the cost of land for low-income housing.

establish a zoning board to appeal restrictive zoning decisions and ordinances.

allow the pre-emption of zoning decisions which involve low-income housing.

require the upward transfer of the zoning power.

require zoning ordinances to specify a mandatory percentage of low-income housing units in all new projects.

require the zoning of a minimum percentage of land for low-income housing.

combine the zoning process with the fiscal system by requiring the "richer" localities to zone an increasing amount of land for low-income housing.

provide funds for the necessary auxiliary services in the less-developed subareas.

either reinstate or improve the Federal housing programs.

establish state housing authorities or corporations to develop low-income housing or provide funds for the development of low-income housing.

require major industries relocating in the outer city to provide housing for their low-income employees.

establish regional housing authorities empowered to receive and then assign funds within its jurisdiction for subsidized housing.

require the *approval* of the regional agency for the use of all subsidized housing funds within its jurisdiction.

amend the A-95 review process to include all subsidized housing projects, regardless of the number of units.

require the conformity to a regional distribution plan in order for a jurisdiction to receive special revenue-sharing funds.

deny State and/or Federal grants to jurisdictions not providing low-income housing in accordance with a regional distribution plan. Conversely, increase grants to jurisdictions complying with the plan.

prohibit industry from moving to suburban jurisdictions whose housing market is closed to families earning what low-income employees of the plant will earn.

forbid Federal installations in a jurisdiction, or Federal contracts with a firm in such a jurisdiction, which does not have housing for all income groups to be employed there or presently employed there.

The state is the most appropriate level of government to provide legislative action in most of the above measures. The record is clear that most localities, including counties, have made virtually no effort to provide low-income housing outside of the central city. Although the Federal government has the "power of the purse," this level of government is often too remote from the problem to deal with it sensitively and effectively. In addition, the present administration is not committed to a policy of distributing low-income housing outside the central city. Regional agencies do not have the authority to implement these recommendations. The states, however, have the jurisdictional reach, the legislative authority, and increasing fiscal capabilities to implement most of the proper auxiliary programs and legislation needed to overcome the obstacles to implementing a regional distribution plan. However, even with the necessary legislation, cooperation is needed on all levels of government for the plan's implementation to be successful.

APPENDIX A

MARTIN JARRET
891 Briarcliff Rd., N.E., Apt. A-2
Atlanta, Georgia 30306

SURVEY—REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION PLANS FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING

Name of Agency ______________________________

I What is the present status of the housing distribution plan in your region? Please check one of the following:
- ___ Have not yet begun formulating a plan.
- ___ Have begun, but not completed, formulating a plan.
- ___ Have completed a plan.
- ___ Have begun implementing a plan.
- ___ Other (Please specify) ______________________

II Below are several items which may be obstacles in the implementation of such a housing distribution plan. Please check one of the first three columns, which ask whether each item is or will be an obstacle. If applicable, check one of the last three columns which describe the extent of the obstacle.

OBSTACLE	No Obstacle is Anticipated or has Occurred	Obstacle has Occurred	Obstacle is Anticipated	Extent of Obstacle		
				Severe	Moderate	Minimal
A. Legal and Administrative						
1. Restrictive zoning practices.						
2. Local referendums.						
3. Commitment of HUD to a policy of distributing low-income housing.						
4. Commitment of the state to a policy of distributing low-income housing.						
5. Commitment of local officials to a policy of distributing low income-housing.						
B. Economic						
6. High cost of land in suburbs.						
C. Services						
7. Overcrowding of schools.						
8. Inadequate public transportation.						
9. Inadequate health services						
10. Inadequate social services.						
D. Neighborhood Objections						
11. Resistance by the adjoining property owners						
E. Other Obstacles						
12.						
13.						
14.						

III Which of the previously mentioned obstacles do you consider:

A. The most severe? ______________________________

B. The second most severe? ________________________

C. The third most severe? _________________________

IV How have you, or how do you propose, to overcome:

A. The most severe obstacle?

B. The second most severe obstacle?

C. The third most severe obstacle?

D. Other obstacles?

V What methods, other than those you presently have the authority or enabling legislation to use, would you recommend to assist in implementing regional distribution plans for low-income housing?

VI What government programs or legislation (federal or state) do you need to assist in implementing a regional distribution plan for low-income housing?

VII What geographic or political area (census tracts, planning areas, counties, etc.) should be used for designating a "fair share" of low-income housing within a region? Please explain.

VIII Please discuss below how the following concepts compare in their applicability to a regional distribution plan:

1. small scattered sites (less than 100 units) composed entirely of low-income residents.

2. A large site composed entirely of low-income residents, built in a separate neighborhood within a larger community. The residents would still share community facilities.
3. Large planned communities with families with mixed incomes.

IX Which of the above concepts is the most desirable for the tenants?

X Please make any other comments pertinent to locating low-income housing throughout a metropolitan region.

APPENDIX B

AGENCIES SURVEYED AND THE STATUS OF THEIR DISTRIBUTION PLANS

	Have Not Begun Formulating a Plan	Have Begun But Not Completed a Plan	Have Completed a Plan	Have Begun Implementing a Plan
Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission				X
Washington COG				X
San Bernardino County Planning Department				X
Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area				X
Dade County Planning Department			X	
Department of Community Affairs—Pennsylvania			X	
Sacramento Regional Planning Commission			X	
San Francisco Department of City Planning			X	
Fulton County Planning Department		X		
Bucks County Planning Department			X	
Puget Sound Government Conference		X		

Agencies Surveyed and the Status
of Their Distribution Plans (Continued)

Agencies Surveyed	Have Not Begun Formulating a Plan	Have Begun But Not Completed a Plan	Have Completed a Plan	Have Begun Implementing a Plan
Atlanta Regional Commission		X		
Cleveland Planning Dept.		X		
Southeast Michigan COG*		X		
Tri-State Regional Planning Commission*		X		
Mid-American Regional Council (Kansas)**		X		
Bay Area Association of Governments**			X	
Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission**			X	

*Have not made sufficient progress to complete survey.

**Did not respond.

APPENDIX C

SURVEY RESULTS

Obstacle	No Obstacle is Anticipated or Has Occurred	Obstacle Has Occurred	Obstacle Is Anticipated	EXTENT OF OBSTACLE		
				Severe	Moderate	Minimal
A. <u>LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE</u>						
1. Restrictive zoning practices	3	4	6	5	4	1
2. Local referendums	11	2	0	1	1	0
3. Commitment of HUD to a policy of distributing low-income housing	8	3	2	2	3	0
4. Commitment of the state to a policy of distributing low-income housing	8	1	4	1	3	1
5. Commitment of local officials to a policy of distributing low-income housing	3	7	3	3	7	0
B. <u>ECONOMIC</u>						
6. High cost of land in suburbs	2	7	4	7	4	0
C. <u>SERVICES</u>						
7. Overcrowding of schools	5	4	4	0	6	2
8. Inadequate public transportation	3	5	5	3	5	2
9. Inadequate health services	6	3	4	0	5	2
10. Inadequate social services	3	4	6	1	6	2

Survey Results (Continued)

Obstacle	No Obstacle is Anticipated or Has Occurred	Obstacle Has Occurred	Obstacle is Anticipated	EXTENT OF OBSTACLE: Severe	Moderate	Minimal
D. NEIGHBORHOOD OBJECTIONS						
11. Resistance by the adjoining property owners	0	10	3	9	3	1
E. OTHER OBSTACLES (Write-Ins)						
12. HUD moratorium	-	4	2	6	0	0
13. HUD guidelines	-	1	1	2	0	0
14. Availability of land	-	1	0	0	1	0
15. Water and sewer moratorium	-	1	0	1	0	0
16. Previous urban renewal commitment	-	1	0	1	0	0
17. Environmental requirements raising costs	-	1	0	0	1	0
18. Lack of mechanism to require inclusion in new projects	-	1	0	1	0	0

LITERATURE CITED

1. *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: Bantam Books, 1968), p. 407.

2. United States Bureau of the Census, *1970 United States Summary, General Population Characteristics* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970).

3. *Ibid.*

4. Report of the National Commission on Urban Problems, *Building the American City* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), p. 43.

5. Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission, *A Housing Plan for the Miami Valley Region* (Dayton, Ohio, July, 1970).

6. Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area, *Distribution and Types of Subsidized Housing in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area* (St. Paul, Minn., September, 1971), p. 3.

7. Richard Ratcliff, *Urban Land Economics* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1949), pp. 321-30.

8. *Ibid.*, pp. 324-8.

9. Charles Abrams, *The Future of Housing* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946), pp. 166-7.

10. Robert Kevin Brown, *Real Estate Economics—An Introduction to Urban Land Use* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965), pp. 267-8.

11. Ratcliff, *op. cit.*, p. 333.

12. The Report of the President's Committee on Urban Housing, *A Decent Home* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 44.

13. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, *op. cit.*, p. 468.

14. Dick Netzer, *Economics and Urban Problems* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1970), p. 22.

15. Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

16. Mary E. Brooks, *Lower Income Housing: The Planners' Response* (Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, Planning Advisory Service, July-August, 1972), p. 6.

17. Edward Logue, *Look* (April 1, 1969), p. 70.

18. Nina Jaffe Gruen and Claude Gruen, *Low and Moderate Income Housing in the Suburbs—An Analysis for the Dayton Region* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972), p. 10.

19. The Report of the President's Committee on Urban Housing, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

20. Gruen, *op. cit.*

21. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, *Housing Policies and Programs for Metropolitan Washington--1971*), p. 46.

22. Paul Davidoff, Linda Davidoff and Neil Gold, "Suburban Action: Advocate Planning for an Open Society," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, XXXVI (January, 1970), p. 13.

23. National Commission on Urban Problems, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

24. Netzer, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

25. Tri-State Regional Planning Commission, *Balancing Jobs and Housing in the Tri-State Region* (New York, Interim Technical Report 4240-3401, July, 1972), p. 7.

26. Netzer, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

27. James Coleman, *Equality of Equal Opportunity* (Washington, D.C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

28. Gruen, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-6.

29. Geoffrey Shields and L. Sanford Spector, "Opening Up the Suburbs: Notes on a Movement for Social Change," *Yale Review of Law and Social Action* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale Law School, Summer, 1972), pp. 301-7.

30. *Ibid.*, p. 312.

31. *Gautreaux vs. Chicago Housing Authority*, 265 F. Supp. 582 (N.D. Ill., 1967).

32. *Shannon vs. HUD*, 436 F. 2d 809 (3rd Cir. 1970).

33. *Crow vs. Brown,* 332 F. Supp. 382 (N.D. Ga., 1971).

34. Shields, *op. cit.,* pp. 320-1.

35. "Title 24—Housing and Urban Development," *Federal Register,* Vol. 37, No. 4 (January 7, 1972), pp. 203-11.

36. Brooks, *op. cit.,* p. 17.

37. *Ibid.,* pp. 18-20.

38. Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission, *op. cit.,* p. 26; and San Bernardino County Planning Department, *Government Subsidized Housing Distribution Model* (San Bernardino, California, January 20, 1972), p. 4.

39. Sacramento Regional Area Planning Commission, *An Approach to the Distribution of Low and Moderate Income Housing* (Sacramento, California, August, 1972), p. 9.

40. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, *Fair Share Housing Formula* (Washington, D.C., January, 1972), p. 5.

41. San Bernardino County Planning Department, *loc. cit.*

42. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, *loc. cit.*

43. *Ibid.* and Association of Bay Area Governments, Staff Report to the Members of the Regional Housing Task Force (Berkeley, California, January 9, 1973), p. 3.

44. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, *op. cit.,* p. 6.

45. Miami Valley Regional Planning Agency, *op. cit.,* pp. 26-7; and County of San Bernardino, *op. cit.;* and Sacramento Regional Planning Commission, *op. cit.*

46. Miami Valley Regional Planning Agency, *op. cit.,* p. 27.

47. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, *loc. cit.*

48. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, *loc. cit.*

49. *Ibid.,* p. 6.

50. San Bernardino County Planning Department, *loc. cit.*

51. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, *loc. cit.*

52. *Ibid.*

53. Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area, *Interim Housing Allocation Proposal* (St. Paul, Minnesota, December 15, 1971), pp. 2-3.

54. Bucks County Planning Department, *Bucks County Housing Plan, Part IV: A Method for Allocating Housing to Municipalities* (Bucks County, Pennsylvania, September, 1972), p. 10.

55. Association of Bay Area Governments, *loc. cit.*

56. Bucks County Planning Department, *loc. cit.*

57. Dale Bertsch and Ann M. Shafor, "A Regional Housing Plan: The Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission Experience," *Planners Notebook* (American Institute of Planners, April, 1971), p. 2.

58. *Ibid.*, pp. 2-4.

59. Washington Council of Governments, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-6.

60. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

61. *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

62. Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

63. *Ibid.*

64. *Ibid.*, p. 2.

65. *Ibid.*, pp. 2-4.

66. Sacramento Regional Planning Commission, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-16; and San Bernardino County Planning Department, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-11.

67. Sacramento Regional Planning Commission, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

68. San Bernardino County Planning Department, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

69. Sacramento Regional Planning Commission, *op. cit.*, p. 15-16. San Bernardino selected the same criteria as Sacramento, except they did not include Community Development.

70. Sacramento Regional Planning Commission, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-16; and San Bernardino County Planning Department, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-11.

71. Joint Committee for Selection of Public Housing Sites, *Dispersal of Public Housing* (Atlanta, Georgia, March 1, 1972), p. 5.

72. Joint Committee for Selection of Public Housing Sites, *General Areas Report* (Atlanta, Georgia, November 22, 1971), pp. 1-4.

73. Larry Fonts, Director of Fulton County Planning Department, in a personal interview, February 8, 1972.

74. Joint Committee for Selection of Public Housing Sites, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

75. Dale Bertsch, Regional Housing Conference, Georgia State University, April 27, 1973.

76. Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Council, from survey results, returned March 17, 1973.

77. Steven J. Stein, Housing Planner, Bucks County Planning Commission, from survey results, returned February 10, 1973.

78. Dale Bertsch, Executive Director of Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission, from survey results, returned March 2, 1973.

79. Brooks, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

80. *Ibid.*

81. *Ibid.*

82. Larry Fonts, *loc. cit.*

83. Brooks, *loc. cit.*

84. Trudy McFall, "Twin Cities Housing Plan Based on Availability of Services and Facilities," *AIP Newsletter* (Washington, D.C.: American Institute of Planners, June, 1972), p. 11.

85. William E. Issel, "A-95 Used to Address Housing Imbalance," *AIP Newsletter* (Washington, D.C.: American Institute of Planners, June, 1972), pp. 11-12.

86. Gruen, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-5.

87. *Ibid.*, p. 82.

88. East-West Gateway Coordinating Council, *Recommendations for Metropolitan St. Louis Community Development* (St. Louis, Missouri, July 13, 1972), p. 7.

89. Joint Committee for Selection of Public Housing Sites, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

90. San Bernardino County Planning Department, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

91. *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

92. Gruen, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-5.

93. Geoffrey Shields and L. Sanford Spector, "Opening Up the Suburbs: Notes on a Movement for Social Change," *Yale Review of Law and Social Action* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale Law School, Summer, 1972), pp. 323-4.

94. Brooks, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

95. Tri-State Regional Planning Commission, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

96. William Nash, Regional Housing Conference, Georgia State University, April 27, 1973.

97. Brooks, *loc. cit.*

98. *Ibid.*

99. *Ibid.*, pp. 102-5.

100. Luigi Laurenti, *Property Values and Race* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1960), p. 48.

101. National Commission on Urban Problems, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

102. President's Committee on Urban Housing, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-1.

103. Herb Sacket, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Atlanta Regional Office, January 24, 1973.

104. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Atlanta Regional Office, *Typical Total Replacement Costs—Georgia*, January 16, 1973.

105. Alex Coffin, *The Atlanta Constitution*, May 18, 1972.

106. Piedmont Triad Council of Governments, *Land Bank Handbook—Advance Land Acquisition of Sites for Low and Moderate Income Housing* (Greensboro, North Carolina, January, 1972), p. A-2.

107. Richard F. Babcock, *The Zoning Game* (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1966), p. 3.

108. National Commission on Urban Problems, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

109. *Ibid.*, p. 241.

110. President's Committee on Urban Housing, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

111. Paul Davidoff and Neil Gold, Prepared for the President's Committee on Urban Housing, *The Supply and Availability of Land for Low and Moderate Income Families*, 1968, pp. 340-43.

112. Babcock, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

113. Paul Davidoff, Linda Davidoff and Neil Gold, Suburban Action: Advocate Planning for an Open Society," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, XXXVI (January, 1970), pp. 14-15.

114. Shields, *op. cit.*, p. 309.

115. *Oakwood at Madison, Inc. vs. Township of Madison*, 283 A. 2d 353, 356 (1971).

116. Metropolitan Area Planning Council, "Chapter 774—An Interpretive Analysis for Cities and Towns" (Boston, Massachusetts, October, 1969), p. 3.

117. Larry Goldman, Assistant to the President, New York State Urban Development Corporation, survey results, returned March 2, 1973.

118. The President's Committee on Urban Housing, *op. cit.*, pp. 143-44.

119. Metropolitan Area Planning Council, *loc. cit.*

120. Tri-State Regional Planning Commission, *How to Thaw the Zoning Freeze in the Suburbs of the Tri-State Region* (New York, Interim Technical Report 4221-5215, June, 1971), pp. 15-16.

121. Carolyn R. Manchester, Senior Planner, Fairfax County, personal letter, September 13, 1972.

122. International City Management Association, *Urban Information Newsletter* (July-August, 1971), pp. 3-5.

123. Tri-State Regional Planning Commission, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

124. Gruen, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

125. Bertsch, *loc. cit.*

126. President Richard Nixon, Statement on Equal Housing Opportunity, June 11, 1971.

127. George Romney, Secretary of HUD, at a press conference, November 25, 1970.

128. Bowles Ford, Chief of Housing Division, Atlanta Regional Commission, in a personal interview, June 6, 1973.

129. "Neighborhood Veto—A Ruling on Housing," *U. S. News and World Report* (May 10, 1971), p. 38.

130. United States Congress, House of Representatives Committee on Housing, *1972 Housing and Urban Development Act,* Hearings before Subcommittee, 92d Congress, 1st Session, on H.R. 9688, July 8, 1971 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office).

131. Paul Davidoff, Linda Davidoff and Neil Gold, "The Suburbs Have to Open their Gates," *The New York Times Magazine* (November 7, 1971), p. 48.

132. National Commission on Urban Problems, *op. cit.,* p. 243.

OTHER REFERENCES

Bailey, Martin J. "Effects of Race and of Other Demographic Factors on the Values of Single-Family Homes," *Land Economics*, XLII, No. 2 (May, 1966), pp. 215-20.

Brooks, Mary. *Exclusionary Zoning.* Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, PAS Report No. 254, 1970.

Bucks County Planning Commission. *Part II—Existing Policies,* Bucks County, Pa., February, 1972.

_______. Memorandum, *Housing Plan.* Bucks County, Pa., Spring, 1971.

Chung, Hyung C. "Regulating the Timing of Residential Development—The Ramapo Study. Submitted for Presentation at Confer-in 72.

Cleveland City Planning Commission. *Housing for Low and Moderate Income Families.* Cleveland, Ohio, January, 1972.

_______. *Housing Summary and Recommended Policy Statement.* Cleveland, Ohio, June, 1970.

Commission on Race and Housing. *Where Shall We Live.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958.

Craig, Lois. "The Dayton Area's 'Fair-Share' Housing Plan Enters the Implementation Stage," *City* (January-February, 1972), pp. 50-56.

Davidoff, Paul. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, XXXI (November, 1965), pp. 331-7.

Donaldson, Scott. "Should the Suburbs Plead Guilty," *City* (January-February, 1972), pp. 57-59.

Downs, Anthony. "Alternative Forms of Future Urban Growth in the United States," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners,* XXXVI, No. 1 (January, 1970), pp. 3-11.

Due, John F. *Government Finance: Economics of the Public Sector.* Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irvin, Inc., 1968.

Foote, Nelson, Janet Abu-Lughod, Mary Foley, and Louis Winnick. *Housing Choices and Housing Constraints.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Ford, Bowles. Chief of Housing Division, Atlanta Regional Commission, Personal Interviews, December 11, 1972, and January 24, 1973.

Gans, Herbert J. *The Levittowners: Ways of Life and Politics in a Suburban Community*. New York: Vintage Books, 1969.

Gans, Herbert J. *People and Plans—Essays on Urban Problems and Solutions*. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Gordon, Virginia. Suburban Action Institute, Personal Interview, December 21, 1972.

Grier, Eunice and Grier, George. *The Impact of Race on Neighbors in the Metropolitan Setting*. Washington, D.C.: Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, 1961.

Gruen, Nina J. "Man and His Neighbors Reexamined," *Planning*, XXXIX, No. 1 (January, 1973), pp. 18-21.

Hammer, Green, Siler Associates. *Regional Housing Planning—A Technical Guide* (prepared for the American Institute of Planners), March, 1972.

Hayunga, Delroy. *The Suburban Frontier*. New York: Suburban Action Institute and the Board of National Missions of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States, October, 1971.

Joint Committee for Selection of Public Housing Sites. Committee Recommendations for Selection of Public Housing Sites. Atlanta, Georgia, March 1, 1972.

Karmin, Monroe W. "How Dayton's Elite Opened Its Suburbs," *Wall Street Journal*, May 11, 1972.

Kriesberg, Louis. "Neighborhood Setting and the Isolation of Public Housing Tenants," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, XXXIV (January, 1968), pp. 43-5.

Kristensen, Chris, John Levy, and Tamar Savir. *The Suburban Lock-Out Effect*. New York: The Suburban Action Institute, March, 1971.

Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission. *A Housing Profile of the Miami Valley Region*. Dayton, Ohio, April, 1972.

_______. *A Housing Plan for the Miami Valley Region—A Summary*. Dayton, Ohio, July, 1970.

Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Area. *Housing Review Manual*. St. Paul, Minnesota, June, 1972.

______. *Metropolitan Development Guide*, St. Paul, Minnesota, February 25, 1971.

______. *Summary of 1971 Minnesota Housing Legislature*. Housing Report No. 4. St. Paul, Minnesota, January, 1972.

Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department. *Housing in the Metropolitan Plan*. Dade County, Florida (undated).

National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing. *How the Federal Government Builds Ghettoes*. New York, October, 1968.

New York State Urban Development Corporation. *Annual Report 1971*. New York, 1972.

Sacramento Regional Area Planning Commission. *Federally Assisted Housing in the Sacramento Region*. Sacramento, California, March, 1972.

Shipler, David K. "The Moral Dilemma of Zoning," *The Nation* (August 3, 1970), pp. 30-33.

Suburban Action Institute, "The Suburban Lock-Out Effect."

Tri-State Regional Planning Commission. *Toward a Regional Housing Strategy*. Interim Technical Report 4277-9637. New York, March, 1972.

Tri-State Transportation Commission. *The Initial Housing Element*. Internal Technical Report 4152-2412. New York, October, 1969.

Washington Council of Governments. *A Brief Guide to Housing Distribution Plans in Various Metropolitan Areas and Counties*. Washington, D.C., August 11, 1972.

______. *Housing Policies and Programs for Metropolitan Washington-1970*.

"UDC's Logue Sets Fast Pace in Race Against Urban Crisis," *Engineering News—Record* (March 23, 1972).